Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-064
Tuesday
6 April 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-064 6 March 1993

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

France Calls For End to Hostilities in Nagorno-Karabakh *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
Commentary Views Grachev Visit to Brussels *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Apr]* 1
Interparliamentary Assembly To Keep Ties With Northern Council *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
Alma-Ata Hosts Asian Security Forum *[ITAR-TASS]* 2

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Black Sea Fleet Denies Attack on Ukrainian Defense Units *[INTERFAX]* 3
ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 6 Apr 3

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Clinton, Yeltsin Hold News Conference 4 Apr *[Moscow TV]* 4
Shokhin Comments on Summit Aid Package Benefits *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Sees Influence on Debt Restructuring *[INTERFAX]* 10
Germany's Kinkel Assesses Summit Results *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Media Comment on Outcome of Vancouver Summit 10
'New Landmark' in Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 10
Summit Termed 'Successful' *[Moscow International]* 11
Yeltsin, Clinton Take 'Risks' *[Russian TV]* 11
Movement Toward Practical Cooperation *[Moscow Radio]* 12
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Military Topics *[6 Apr]* 12
Yeltsin, Clinton Face 'Uphill Task' *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 6 Apr]* 14
Western Aid Prospects Viewed *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 6 Apr]* 14
West Sees Role as 'Business Partner' *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 6 Apr]* 15
'Realism' of Aid Package Hailed *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 16
'Undue Hopes' Misplaced *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 17
Japan Supports Clinton's Stance on Russian Reforms *[ITAR-TASS]* 18
Congressman Gephardt Previews Visit to Moscow *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 19
U.S. Aid Organization Sends $2 Million in Aid *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
U.S. Grain Aid To Break State's Trading 'Monopoly' *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 6 Apr]* 19
Cosmonaut Heads Association for Cooperation With U.S. *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
U.S. Scientists Concerned Over 'Topaz' Reactors *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 20
Arctic 'Search and Rescue' Exercise With U.S. Previewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 20
Government Statement on Ukraine's Nuclear Weapons *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
Ukraine Diplomat on Russian Statement *[INTERFAX]* 22
Officials Criticize Ukrainian Attitude *[INTERFAX]* 22
Differences With Ukraine Over START Explained *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 6 Apr]* 23
Last Air Defense Units in Georgia Cease Operation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 24
Grachev Goes to Sochi To Discuss Abkhazia, Troop Status *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Chernomyrdin Meets Belarusian Counterpart Kebich *[INTERFAX]* 24
'Gratifying' Outcome to Strategic Forces Talks With Belarus *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Apr]* 24
Tough Stance on Baltics Reflects Domestic Policy Pressure *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 2 Apr]* 25
Paris Club Defers Debt Repayments for 10 Years *[ITAR-TASS]* 25
IMF Decision on 'Quicker Financial Aid' *[ITAR-TASS]* 25
Shumeyko: Italy Ready To Support Moscow at G-7 Talks *[INTERFAX]* 26
Croatian Envoy Lauds Russian Participation in Peace Plan *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 3 Apr]* 26
Foreign Ministry Welcomes Macedonian Stand on UN Membership *[ITAR-TASS]* 26
Shakhray Meets German State Secretary in Bonn *[ITAR-TASS]* 27
Further on Statement on DPRK Treaty Withdrawal *[Moscow Radio]* 27

Controls Stepped Up To Halt Scientists Leaving for DPRK *[Moscow TV]* 27
Khasbulatov Receives PRC Ambassador; Reforms To Continue *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
Work on Border Demarcation With China Begins *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 28
Chief of Chinese Naval Forces Arrives *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 6 Apr]* 28
Foreign Ministry Official's Visit to East Africa Reviewed *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
Plane With Russian Crew Fired Upon in Angola *[ITAR-TASS]* 29
Algerian State Council Chairman Receives Yeltsin Envoy *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Qatar's Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow *[ITAR-TASS]* 29

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political Issues

'Fourth' Roundtable Session Opens in Moscow 6 Apr 30
Calls For 'Economic Solidarity Pact' *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
Rutskoy Predicts 'Civil War' *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
Further on Roundtable *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
Yeltsin's Approval Rating 'Unexpectedly' Drops *[INTERFAX]* 30
Poll Highlights Opinion on Yeltsin-Khasbulatov Clash *[KURANTY 2 Apr]* 31
Rutskoy Says Yeltsin Should Dismiss Shumeyko, Others *[Tokyo TV]* 31
'Power' Ministers' Presence at Yeltsin Rally Deplored *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Apr]* 32
Stankevich, Sokolov Comment on Political Situation *[Moscow TV]* 32
Appointment, Yeltsin Report Signals Corruption Battle *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 2 Apr]* 34
Article Argues Need for Russian Unity *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 34
Comment Sees Reformers' Triumph at Congress *[KURANTY 2 Apr]* 36
Communist Party Leaders Hold News Conference *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 37
Interview With Communist Party Leader Zyuganov *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 37
Lipitskiy Admits 'Differences' Within Civic Union *[INTERFAX]* 39
Head of 'President's Chancellery' Interviewed *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 2 Apr]* 39

Referendum Issues

'Opposition' Airs Views on Ninth Congress, Referendum *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Shumeyko Interviewed on Referendum, Elections *[INTERFAX]* 42
Electoral Chairman: Observers Not Needed for Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 43
Yeltsin Reaction to Congress Referendum Maneuvers Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 43
Referendum Question on Economy 'Meaningless' *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 44
Rutskoy Aide Urges Post-Referendum 'Nonaggression Pact' *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 6 Apr]* 45
'Democratic' Groups Support Referendum, Oppose Early Vote *[INTERFAX]* 46
Propose Opinion Poll With Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 46
Communists Appeal for 'No Confidence' Vote in Yeltsin *[INTERFAX]* 46

Economic Issues

Chernomyrdin Demands Solutions to Agricultural Problems *[Moscow TV]* 47
Officials Analyze Farmers' Problems *[ITAR-TASS]* 47
Government Establishes Fund To Support Competition *[Russian TV]* 47
Minister Says Fuel Industries' Situation 'Catastrophic' *[INTERFAX]* 47
Yeltsin Signs Decree Protecting Savings Against Inflation *[Moscow International]* 48
Deputy Prime Minister Chubays Discusses Privatization *[Moscow TV]* 48
Minister Glazyev Criticizes Central Bank Export Policy *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 2 Apr]* 50
Glazyev Cited on Draft Program for Industrial Exports *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 51

Military & Space Issues

Meeting Views Problems of Counterintelligence *[Moscow TV]* 51
Cosmos-2240 Satellite Launched 2 Apr *[ITAR-TASS]* 52

Supreme Soviet

Parliamentarian Suggests Postponing START II Hearings *[INTERFAX]* 52

New First Deputy Chairman Voronin Profiled *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 52
Voronin Grants Interview *[Russian TV]* 53
'Machinations' on Referendum Vote Counting Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 55
Presidium Reportedly To Set Up Bodyguard Department
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Apr] 56
Supreme Soviet Passes Agriculture Bills 2 Apr *[Moscow TV]* 56
Nationalities Soviet Discusses Crime Fight Bill *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Apr]* 56

Regional Affairs

Yeltsin Meets Supporters During Brief Stopover in Bratsk *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
Comments on Summit *[Moscow TV]* 57
Further on Yeltsin Stopover in Magadan *[Vladivostok Radio]* 58
Mordovian Supreme Soviet Abolishes Post of President *[Moscow TV]* 59
Called 'A Constitutional Coup' *[Moscow TV]* 59
Vice President Comments *[ITAR-TASS]* 59
Dagestan Official Survives Assassination Attempt *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet Adds to Referendum *[Moscow TV]* 60
Bashkortostan Parliament Head Worried by Political Crisis *[INTERFAX]* 60
Sakhalin, Kurils Deputies Approve New Oblast Head *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
Chechen Officials Comment on People's Deputies *[Moscow TV]* 61
Shakhray Attends Cooperation Conference in Krasnodar 61
Comments on Referendum, Decree on Cossacks *[ITAR-TASS]* 61
Resolution on Draft Program Passed *[INTERFAX]* 61
Further Shakhray Comment *[INTERFAX]* 62
Exercises To Be Held in North Caucasian District *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
Military Exercises Begin *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
Chechnya To React to Exercises *[INTERFAX]* 63

UKRAINE

International Affairs

U.S. Delegation Arrives To Examine Economic Advances *[Kiev International]* 64
Kuchma Says No Nuclear Problem *[INTERFAX]* 64
START I Ratification Linked to Security Guarantees *[Kiev International]* 64
Defense Ministry Protests Use of Fleet in Georgian War *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 2 Apr]* 64

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Strategic Arms May Be Moved to Russia Ahead of Schedule *[ITAR-TASS]* 65
U.S. Ambassador Hails Accord on Embassy Property *[BELINFORM]* 65
Shushkevich Receives North Atlantic Assembly Delegation *[Minsk Radio]* 65
Fuel Shortage Prompts Prime Minister's Visit to Moscow *[Minsk Radio]* 65
Working Group Formed To Expand Economic Ties With Russia *[Minsk Radio]* 65
Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Latvia, Discusses Ties *[RID]* 65

Moldova

Defense Minister Comments on NATO Meeting, 14th Army Issues *[Bucharest Radio]* 66

CENTRAL ASIA

Tajikistan

Foreign Ministry Warns Afghanistan on Border Violation *[ITAR-TASS]* 67
CSCE Representatives Arrive in Dushanbe *[ITAR-TASS]* 67
Russian Forces Help Government Against Opposition Militants *[INTERFAX]* 67
10 Russian Border Guards Abducted 5 Apr *[ITAR-TASS]* 67

Uzbekistan

Karimov Says 'No Alternative' to Yeltsin *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Turkish President, Delegation Continue Visit *[Tashkent Radio]* 68
Cetin on Humanitarian Flights *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 68
Cooperation Agreements Signed With Malaysia *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 68

CAUCASUS

Armenia

President Meets U.S. Congressmen, Denies Support to Karabakh *[INTERFAX]* 69
Prime Minister Briefs U.S. Congressmen on Karabakh *[Yerevan Radio]* 69
Only 1.5 Million Cubic Meters of Gas Received Daily *[INTERFAX]* 69
Over 100,000 Trees Cut Down for Fuel Over Winter *[INTERFAX]* 70
Russian Troops Complete Exercises in Gyumri *[Yerevan International]* 70
Parliament Passes Law Naming Armenian as State Language
[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 2 Apr] 70

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Receives U.S. Congressmen in Baku *[INTERFAX]* 70
U.S. Ambassador Voices Concern Over Armenian Aggression *[ITAR-TASS]* 71
Elchibey Claims Russian Servicemen Aiding Armenians *[INTERFAX]* 71
Elchibey Addresses Envoys on 'Extremely Grave' Situation *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 71
Envoy Claims Russian Army Involved in Armenian Attacks *[Russian TV]* 72
Government Calls For UN Session on Armenian 'Aggression' *[ITAR-TASS]* 72
Government Asks Compatriots Abroad To Help Refugees *[INTERFAX]* 72
Army Situation Near Fizuli 'Remains Difficult' *[INTERFAX]* 72
Elchibey Appoints Military Commanders *[Baku Radio]* 73

Georgia

Shevardnadze Discusses Policy, Abkhazia, Russian Relations *[Moscow TV]* 73
Views Russia, Other Issues *[Tbilisi Radio]* 78

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Further on Russian Troop Withdrawal Issue 82
Foreign Ministry Statement *[Tallinn Radio]* 82
Negotiator Comments *[BALTFAX]* 82
Hard Currency Payments Possible *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 2 Apr]* 82

Latvia

Gorbunovs Expresses Concern Over Yeltsin Remarks *[BALTFAX]* 83
Russian 'Interference' Criticized *[Riga International]* 83
'Nothing New' in Grachev's Statement on Withdrawal *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 3 Apr]* 83
'Equality' Parliamentary Faction Appeals to Clinton *[BALTFAX]* 83
Russian-U.S. Delegation Seeks Information on POW's *[BALTFAX]* 84
Premier Heads People's Front Candidate Lists *[Riga Radio]* 84
Law Adopted on Return of Confiscated Land, Property *[Riga International]* 85

Lithuania

Prime Minister Interviewed on Talks in Russia *[Vilnius Radio]* 85
Discusses Economic Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 86
Withdrawal of Russian Military Equipment Increases *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
Landsbergis Wants Russia Pressured Over Troop Withdrawal *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
Western Military Presence Viewed *[BALTFAX]* 87

France Calls For End to Hostilities in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0504170293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1626 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Krasnoshchekov]

[Text] Paris April 5 TASS—France is concerned over the escalation of armed conflicts in the Caucasus, specifically in Azerbaijan's Kelbadzhar district located between Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh and calls on all warring parties to stop immediately all hostilities, an official spokesman of the French Foreign Ministry said here today.

He emphasised that Paris is committed to a peace settlement of the Karabakh problem and calls for holding a CSCE-sponsored international conference on the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh.

The spokesman pointed out that "Paris fully supports efforts by all countries aimed at convincing the warring parties to show restraint," and is prepared to form immediately a contact with all interested parties to look for ways to settle the conflict at the negotiating table.

Commentary Views Grachev Visit to Brussels

PM0504151193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Apr 93 Single Edition p 7

["Commentary" by Desk Editor Vladimir Tyurkin: "Smoke and Fire. The Last Afterword to the Long-Gone Visit to Brussels by P. Grachev"]

[Text] Some events, such as the visit by the Russian defense minister to the NATO "lair" in Brussels—an extraordinary event—seem predestined to excite the public. From the moment that Pavel Grachev defied our country's military-diplomatic tradition, which is normally wrapped up in uniform, by showing off his handsome civilian clothes in the Belgian capital, observers have not stopped being amazed.

First of all, there is the fact that he went there, because in the eyes of Western strategists such an important official in the military hierarchy should not have left Moscow at a politically tense time, when power lies in the streets and the Russian Army has suddenly started unanimously being given the role of a "third force." Well, at least that is logical.

P. Grachev's famous statement on the temporary suspension of the withdrawal of Russian troops from the three Baltic countries generated a reaction that was at first sight out of proportion. Our defense minister's colleagues in the United States, Britain, the FRG, and even... Iceland expressed indignation and protest.

The fact that by his visit and his speech, the Russian marshal [as published] confirmed Moscow's new attitude to military-political realities in Europe—and this is a radical aspect of its security—was received absentmindedly, almost indifferently. Although, note, our participation in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, which includes the countries of NATO, East Europe, the Baltic, and the CIS, is an issue that has by no means been settled in a clearcut way by the Russians, because of different political predilections and a wounded sense of national dignity.

But an issue that is not very significant from the strategic point of view— the **temporary** reduction of the rate of the withdrawal of troops, which, according to Western assessments, are not very numerous and not very efficient, from some tiny countries—has generated a wave of emotions. One would think that P. Grachev had disavowed the statement he made last year on removing North Atlantic targets from the aim of Russian nuclear missiles! It was said plainly: Arguments over facilities were at the heart of the enforced decision on the temporary suspension, not military or political factors. There is nowhere to put the officers in Russia, or the soldiers either; and, incidentally, these are actually the "third force" that is "frightening" the West so much.

But still, what is being seen as the reason for such a sharp reaction? Some people see it as the pedantry of the Western approach, which has almost reached ridiculous proportions: You promised, so you have to do it. Others see it as a contemptuous attitude toward our weakened state, with which, as many people believe, you do not have to worry particularly about standing on ceremony today. Still others see it as NATO's sacred determination to stand up for the freedom and sovereignty of small peoples.

That is all very well, but there is another aspect which people did not even mention under their breaths in Brussels. However, on the day of Grachev's visit, it appeared in print in SVENSKA DAGBLADET in the form of a map of northern Europe, including the countries of the former Soviet Baltic area. The caption was as follows: "In the new structure of the NATO command, the Baltic Sea comes under the new Northwestern command of the 'AF [Air Force] Norwest' bloc. In the past, only the territories of Norway and Denmark were marked on such maps. Now, however, the entire Baltic Sea comes within NATO's sphere of responsibility. The territorial waters of the Baltic states are shaded in as being part of NATO's zone of influence."

So that the fit of nervousness in March in Brussels has, as we can see, a very prosaic explanation.

Interparliamentary Assembly To Keep Ties With Northern Council

LD0604073893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0650 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] St. Petersburg April 6 TASS—Contacts between the Interparliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth countries and the Northern Council will be maintained

on a regular basis. An agreement to this effect was reached during the visit to St. Petersburg by secretary general of the Northern Council Yostein Osnes and Deputy Secretary General Kaj-Peter Mattson, which ended on Monday [5 April].

In the headquarters of the Interparliamentary Assembly prospects for the establishment of an Institute of Parliamentarism were discussed. The sides also discussed problems pertaining to interests of subregional cooperation, especially in the area of the Baltic Sea, the exchange of experience in preparing draft laws on human rights and the rights of ethnic minorities. The sides also discussed problems of aid to member-states of the Northern Council in resolving social problems of Russian troops withdrawn from the Baltic states.

Alma-Ata Hosts Asian Security Forum

LD3003201593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1643 GMT 30 Mar 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulagin]

[Text] Alma-Ata, March 30 TASS—A two-day meeting of Asian foreign ministries' experts on interaction and confidence measures on the continent ended here today.

The forum was attended by representatives of the 11 Asian states and secretariats of the United Nations and the CSCE, as well as Japanese, Indonesian and Thai observers to discuss the implementation of Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev's initiative on Asian security.

The experts praised the initiative, saying it enabled the first step in creation of a stability and security system on the continent, and noted the presence of the all-Asian dialogue, a key condition for well-balanced and constructive approach to the regional problems.

The conference on interaction and confidence measures in Asia is considered to be a stage in the development of this cooperation in the name of peace, stability and prosperity of the region. The experts agreed the multiside forum will help profound analysis of opinion of all the sides and collective elaboration of approaches to the fulfilment of basic confidence and security ideas.

The meeting discussed the procedure of further consultations to pass over the large-scale interaction, by gradually expanding cooperation spheres. As a new practical step, the sides agreed to hold a new expert conference within several months to involve a broad range of states and international organizations to discuss the agenda and procedure of the conference on interaction and confidence measures in Asia at the level of foreign ministers.

Despite geographic, historical, economic, political, social and cultural peculiarities of the Asian states, the process of creation of a collective security structure has begun in Alma-Ata. Meeting participants stated with satisfaction significant efforts have been taken to fully correspond to the concept of United Nations Secretary-General Butrus Butrus-Ghali.

Black Sea Fleet Denies Attack on Ukrainian Defense Units

OW0504214093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1921 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The press center of the Black Sea Fleet on April 5 denied charges that a group of Black Sea Fleet marines attacked a Ukrainian anti-aircraft defence unit on March 31.

The Ukrainian side claims that a group of five attackers in combat fatigues attacked a company of a Ukrainian anti-aircraft missile defence battalion at about 22 hours on April [as received] 31. The unidentified attackers penetrated the perimeter fence, beat up several soldiers and tried to seize weapons and equipment. One Ukrainian soldier had to be taken to the hospital. Missile-battalion soldiers said the attackers escaped, heading for Kazachya harbor, where the units of Black-Sea-Fleet Marines are deployed.

The Black-Sea Fleet's press center says that the Commander of the Black-Sea Fleet Coast Guards Vladimir Romanenko urgently arrived at the garrison of the Marines to probe into the charges. The inquiry found that the Marines were not responsible for the attack and that it was staged by unidentified persons in the state of alcoholic intoxication.

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 6 Apr

LD0604063193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0514 GMT 6 Apr 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The Russian-U.S. summit meeting, held in the Canadian city of Vancouver last Saturday and Sunday, is the principal topic in today's Moscow-based newspapers.

"The USA-Russia: Rivals Yesterday, Partners Today, and Allies Tomorrow?" is the headline of a detailed account of the Vancouver summit in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR). The newspaper's opinion is that the "Vancouver meeting between Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton ushers in a new stage of Russian-U.S. relations".

"The two leaders believe that the summit opens up a new era in relationships between the world's two major powers which have the most tangible influence on the entire world development, and that the formation of allied relations, not only those of partners, between them, as the president of Russia noted, can only have the most beneficial effect on the world's overall political atmosphere".

"Cooperation, not aid" is what, in the opinion of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA (INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER), determined the tonality of the Vancouver summit. The newspaper emphasised that neither Boris Yeltsin nor Bill Clinton used the term "aid" when speaking about a "Bill Clinton economic package" aimed at promoting the economic reforms policy of President Yeltsin.

The two interlocutors sought to use such terms as "cooperation" and "partnership". "A pointed loyalty was the main feature of the Vancouver summit," NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA stated in this connection.

PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA adhere to different evaluations of the Vancouver summit and its results. PRAVDA's news analyst Viktor Linnik believes that "the Vancouver meeting really became an historic one: it officially recorded inequality between Russia and the United States". The newspaper's Washington correspondent Vladislav Drobkov is of the opinion that "the echo to be produced in Russia by the talks in Vancouver may turn out to be much more important than the summit itself".

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA thinks that the two-day talks in Vancouver resulted in Boris Yeltsin's return home with a "light baggage".

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA runs two interviews in connection with the forthcoming all-Russia referendum on April 25. President Mikhail Nikolayev of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), in an interview with the newspaper's correspondent, called for the dissolution of the congress of the people's deputies of Russia as the one that "exhausted its resources". Karelian parliament chief Viktor Stepanov pointed out the need for an "early election of all federal power bodies—both a president and parliament".

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA reported the details of the death of Tajikistan popular front leader Sangak Safarov several days ago. It has become finally known that he was killed as a result of a quarrel and an ensuing shoot-out with his former associate Faizaliy Saidov.

There is an interview in the newspaper with former Russian Economics Minister Andrey Nechayev who emphasised in comment in his resignation that he, apparently, "failed to fit into the new team"—the Viktor Chernomyrdin government.

Clinton, Yeltsin Hold News Conference 4 Apr

LD0504123193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0820 GMT 5 Apr 93

[News conference by President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and President Bill Clinton with unidentified and other correspondents in Vancouver on 4 April—recorded; Clinton and U.S. correspondents speak in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Clinton] Good afternoon. I have just ended two days of extremely productive talks with President Boris Yeltsin. I would like to join with him in expressing thanks to Prime Minister Mulroney and the Canadian people for the hospitality we have received. The beauties and the sights of Vancouver have been an inspiration for our work.

Over the course of this weekend we laid down a new foundation for partnership, for democratic partnership between the United States and Russia. The heroic steps by Boris Yeltsin and the Russian people have led to the launch of their reforms, which are going in the direction of democracy and a market economy, and which were defended with valor during the troubled times of August 1991. Now it is in the interests of all democratic countries of the world, and, indeed, it is their lofty duty, to defend Russia's democratic reforms.

In this day of most difficult tasks, the contrast between the highly promising new partnership and our confrontational past highlights the possibilities which are today in the balance. For 45 years we continued a myth, a dangerous rivalry in the sphere of nuclear weapons. Now we can develop secure cooperation, permanent cooperation, so as to cut the arsenals that threaten mankind. For 45 years we put trillions of dollars into holding back and halting Soviet communism; now, the emergence of the new, democratic Russia, a peaceful Russia, enables us to channel more of our resources into needs at home.

The emergence of a new and prosperous Russia may make available untold billions for fresh development of the global economy. This will create new jobs and new opportunities for the Russian people, for our allies, all over the world. We are today putting our resources not only into the future of Russia, but also into the future of America.

Mr. President, our state will not be on the sidelines when we look in the direction of the democratic success of Russia. We know where we are; we are in favor of democratic reforms, and we support Russian democracy and a Russian free market. We support freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of religion. We support and respect the rights of ethnic minorities. We actively support the reforms of reformers such as you all over Russia. The final responsibility for Russia's success undoubtedly lies in Russia itself; it is in the hands of the great Russian people. It is they who must back the economic reforms and set them in motion. But Americans know that our state, too, has a role to play, and it will indeed play that role. In our talks, President Yeltsin and I concluded a whole range of major agreements on how the United States and other major democratic industrial countries can support democratic reforms and the reforms in Russia.

There are programs which will be implemented directly. I have discussed with President Yeltsin initiatives totalling $1.6 billion, which should promote economic and political transformations in Russia. These programs are already being financed and will yield direct results for the Russian people. We are investing resources for the development of the Russian private sector, based on two funds which will speed up privatization and will provide funds for new small-scale enterprises. We will resume grain supplies to Russia, and will make available to Russia a loan of $700 million to enable Russia to purchase American grain. There is also a special project to provide housing, and also to retrain Russian officers when they take up new jobs in the civilian sectors. And because the pace of these reforms must be set by the Russian people, rather than by the Russian Government, we will expand exchanges between U.S. firms, and between businessmen and others on the basis of technical expertise, working with the Russian people directly. We have agreed to put in special efforts to promote U.S. capital investment, especially in the oil and gas industry in Russia.

We then plan to get all this under way, and we have asked Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin to head a new commission on power engineering and space. In addition to these immediate programs, the president and I have agreed that our partnership should be expanded further through initiatives which we will discuss with Congress leaders when we go home. We will do even more in the sphere of housing, technical assistance and nuclear security, and cooperation in environmental protection.

This is a task and a challenge not only for Russia and for America. I have asked our allies to put forward their own, additional bilateral initiatives. Canada and Great Britain have already done this, and other states will, I think, follow their example.

President Yeltsin and I also discussed plans for the G-7 states to act together and back the reforms in Russia. The G-7 ministers of finance and foreign affairs will be meeting with their Russian counterparts on 14-15 April in Tokyo. Coordinated efforts are essential to enable Russia to stabilize its currency and strengthen its economy. The president and I agreed that Russia and the G-7 countries should take joint measures in order to underpin the reforms in Russia.

In addition to these economic aspects, the president and I discussed a wide agenda for cooperation in international issues. We confirmed our obligation to reinforce the nonproliferation treaty and certified that Ukraine and Belarus and Kazakhstan should ratify the START

Treaty and should become signatories to the nonproliferation treaty as non-nuclear states. We also want to expand our cooperation with all independent states. We have also agreed to work together in order to help resolve regional crises, to halt proliferation and to protect our environment, in the global sense of the word, and also to promote the cause of international peace as, for example, if one looks at the trends and violence in Bosnia, by promoting the promising peace negotiations which we are jointly moving forward in the Near East, continuing our cooperation in order to put an end to regional conflicts which are a result of the end of the Cold War.

The dreams of many Russians and Americans are linked with their children and with future generations. These are founded upon the long-term success of the reforms in Russia, and consequently upon the long-term partnership between our states. Our new democratic partnership may become a historic contribution for the whole of mankind and may go forward for many centuries ahead.

We are aware that all this demands special efforts and vigilance in order to attain progress on the basis of the path we have chosen, that of the ideals of democracy. I believe that we conceive of these ideals as being enshrined in the human spirit. The words of one of our great poets, Walt Whitman, writing about democracy in our own country, are, I think, worthy of our attention. In a poem dedicated to the East River crossing in New York, where the Brooklyn Bridge is, he tells the river: Keep on flowing, river! The river had no need of such instructions; it had been flowing along for centuries, and will continue to do so, regardless of whether Walt Whitman told it to or not, but we have proclaimed that his enthusiasm for this boundless journey may be compared with our enthusiasm for Russia's struggle for democracy and with America's support.

We know that freedom draws us, but this appealing freedom compels democracy to flow through the human spirit like a trickling stream, and it is not our words that compel that stream to flow. History, however, has now demonstrated that there is no tyrant that can force that trickling stream to stop. And we proclaim out loud our support, because it is just, and because the river of democracy will continue in the future to drive forward our ship of state. We have looked across the Pacific, toward the Russian Far East, over the past few days, and we have assumed the obligation to proceed in that direction and make that self-same journey.

[Yeltsin] First of all I want to thank Mr. President for the kind words he has addressed to Russia. I want to thank Mr. Mulroney, the Canadian prime minister, for his excellent organization of this summit-level meeting between the two presidents of the two great powers. I want to thank the people of Vancouver for being so cordial, for the way they have welcomed our delegations and us, the presidents, and I want to thank the journalists, who I think have been working round the clock.

I am completely satisfied with the spirit and atmosphere of my working meeting with President Bill Clinton. It was an unusual one in every respect. It was made so by the events in the world, the processes in the United States and in Russia, and the special relationship which has developed between Bill Clinton and myself since June of last year. Yesterday we met as presidents for the first time, but we became partners during that meeting in Washington. When Bill Clinton became president, we quickly established a good working contact over the telephone. We discussed frankly the most complex questions. We agreed immediately that there would be no pauses in our dialogue, and that we would quickly find a time to meet, and we determined it several months in advance.

We had no right to postpone a personal meeting. The world is troubled and anxious after coming out of the Cold War covered in wounds, and its future depends largely on what is happening in the two great countries of Russia and the United States of America, on the way relations are developing between them.

We immediately found a common language in Vancouver. Probably that is because we are both men of action, and at the same time, to some extent, idealists. We both believe that freedom, democracy, and the free choice of the people are not just words, and we are ready to fight for our convictions. We understand that everything in the world is interdependent, that cooperation is not a concession, but a vital necessity and an investment in the future.

Previous Russian-American summits dealt mainly with dismantling the old confrontational structures. In Vancouver we have been building the new, first of all working on the economy as the foundation. This was probably the first economic meeting in history between two leaders of the two powers. We adopted major and serious decisions which are in the interests of the people of Russia, in the interests of Americans, in the interests of the whole world.

We began with what has been brewing for a long time: Removing the discriminatory restrictions on trade with Russia. I said that it is simply offensive to us—Russia has suffered to achieve democracy, but the American trade laws continue to regard it as a communist country, which we are still fighting against. That must be changed, and Bill Clinton agreed with me. We are ready for competition, but for honest competition. We agreed to change our approach to Russian uranium sales, to commercial satellite launches, to Russia's access to the arms market. We discussed canceling the Jackson-Vanik amendment, and other legislative questions. Mutual interest was displayed in American investments in Russia's fuel and energy complex, and in cooperation in space affairs. We agreed to create a mechanism for cooperation in this sphere. Leaders of the American and Russian Administrations will be in charge of this question.

Our meeting, and Bill Clinton's economic package—that is what I will be calling it in the future, Bill Clinton's economic package—have destroyed the thesis that America does not want to see a strong Russia—which is

what our opposition says—a flourishing country with a developed market economy. America will support Russian entrepreneurs, particularly medium and small private farmers and young people. There will be cooperation in the construction of housing for servicemen and in other spheres. All this support for the Russian reforms is a strategic alliance with us, Bill Clinton emphasized. Already resources worth $1.6 billion are being allocated to these projects for development. This is a matter for the immediate future. We also discussed further and larger-scale steps which will be undertaken by the United States and the other major industrialized countries to give real support to the reforms in Russia. At the same time, there was no question of linking support with foreign policy issues. Naturally Russia and the United States could not leave aside international and military and political problems. We discussed what needs to be done in order that all the participants in the conflict in Bosnia support the Vance-Owen plan; we are agreed in our main positions on this. We devoted considerable attention to nonproliferation issues. We decided to reach an agreement eliminating the possibility of incidents between us, like the one that recently took place with the submarines. We agreed to make the links between our military departments more active. Our main accords were reflected in the Vancouver declaration.

I will sum up a few results: The members of our delegation felt that the American side understands that support for Russia must come in time. Our partners are setting themselves the task of helping the Russian reforms, which are not yet yielding great results for the average Russian. The meeting in Vancouver marks a transition from general assurances of support for Russia to concrete mutually pragmatic projects. Economic problems are the dominant ones here, not military and strategic ones.

It is also very important that President Clinton and I succeeded in establishing a good personal contact. He is a serious partner. He is prepared to tackle major problems in the interests of our countries, in the interests of the freedom of every person throughout the world. I have invited Bill to make an official visit to Moscow at a time convenient for him. Thank you.

[Correspondent] Will the United States and Russia continue directing nuclear weapons at each other after 45 years?

[Clinton] We discussed this within the framework of the START Treaty, and the schedule within the treaty. We agreed that we would review this in good time. The problem has not been resolved, but we agreed to look into this issue again.

[Correspondent's question in English indistinct]

[Clinton] Will the journalists please speak into the microphone. We can't hear anything. We can't hear the questions, because they are not speaking into the microphone. I am sorry. Can you see the microphones? Will you please speak into the microphones.

[Correspondent] A question for you, Mr. President, and for President Yeltsin. The economic package [words indistinct] is old wine in new bottles. It is what was discussed by the Congress. Why is it different now? Why is there any more difference compared to last year, and what guarantees are there that it will be delivered this time, what was already agreed earlier?

[Clinton] I would like to draw your attention to two facts. The nature of the package is different. It is something that was discussed last year. First, three quarters of these funds will be distributed from government to government, but it will be sent from the American Government to the private sector, and will be outside the central apparatus. Support will be given to privatization. This will make it possible to start new enterprises, and to establish democracy at a significant level. If we look at all that has been put down here, we can see specific things here that ought to lead to specific benefits. As President Yeltsin has said, each of these categories already has a proven mechanism for distribution of aid. We know how to deliver the funds to their designated target.

The second point I wish to make: We intend this to be used in two ways. First, I would like to go back to the Congress, to talk to the leaders of the two parties, with whom I had meetings before my arrival here, to discuss with them the second package of bilateral aid, the package that is to be more aggressive in the sphere of energy, and will support Russia's economy. There will also be more aggression here in the sphere of providing housing for soldiers, which is important in social and political terms, and also in other spheres. We also want each one of G-7 countries to do the same in this direction. We would also like a multilateral agreement be discussed in Tokyoo.

Last year, when we talked of 24 billion, when this was said all over the world, and in Russia too, it was all linked to various issues that have not turned into reality, but now we will try to turn everything that was said into reality. This is where the difference lies. Over to you, Mr. President.

[Yeltsin] I want to stress the great difference between what was was being tackled in the past and what has been resolved, economically speaking, in Bill Clinton's package—economic package: first, a precise linkage to industries in amounts, which makes it possible to check each specific figure, and, second, a linkage to deadlines, which is something entirely new. Twenty-four billion by the year 3000 [as heard] perhaps, was announced—and that was all—and now precise deadlines have been given: 25 april, 27 April, May Day, the month of May, the month of June, the month of September, the month of October, and so on until the end of 1993. That is the principal difference.

Go ahead.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, you have rather anticipated what I wanted to ask. That is to say, briefly, we evidently have a breakthrough in the issue on assistance to reforms in connection with which there has been

nothing normal in the past year, even though a great deal was being said. How do you now regard this assistance to reforms and what do you expect in this connection from the G-7 meeting in Tokyo?

[Yeltsin] Reform, of course, is under way. But it is young. It is one year old. For just one year a unique reform has been under way in the unique Russia. In that one year, 60,000 private enterprises have sprung up in Russia, whereas in the previous 75 years there was not one. This has to be taken into account. In that one year, 5,000 major joint-stock companies have emerged. There were none before. These are success stories of the reform, even if small ones. But of course, some things are slowing down. Of course Russia is out of breath. It has a difficult period of transition ahead of it, some two years probably. And we do need support in this period of transition, for people to endure it, not just aid, but, as I said, support. Delivering equipment, technologies, foodstuffs, goods, etc., means additional jobs in the United States, additional workload for enterprises in the United States, and a better economic situation in the United States. This is what it is all about. So these are not some kind of Christmas gifts. No, this is politics, major politics.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich and President Clinton, you both said that you are devoted to democracy, but you are both idealists. However, we are hearing here a very pragmatic, very specific project. I would simply like to ask now, Boris Nikolayevich, please tell us: The aid which will be supplied to us, how will get it through to us? You said that it would be reaching the industries at a precise time, at a precise place. But the ordinary person... [pauses] Jobs are being created in America...[pauses] But how will things be in Russia? Can you tell us?

[Yeltsin] First, say, 300 million rubles [R] for public health care. This will get through to each person in Russia. Medicines worth R100 million—this will get through to each person in Russia. Technologies. In the final analysis, technologies will produce new consumer goods for each person in Russia. This is aimed at the person. This is the policy of Bill Clinton. This is the policy of Yeltsin: For the people's benefit, for the benefit of each and every free person.

[Correspondent] What guarantees are there from President Yeltsin that these medicines will be delivered on the basis of a system which is very bureaucratic and which suffers from corruption? What guarantees have you given him that there will be no delays on the U.S. side. Do you agree with his statement that there is an agreement between the two leaders on the need to end the Jackson-Vanik amendment as regards CEMA?

[Clinton] I will say that I have not discussed this with anyone. But I want to say first that there have been obstacles in the past from both U.S. agencies and the agencies of other countries and in Russia itself. And now we have asked all the G-7 countries to do two things, that is give bilateral aid from the point of view of developing partnership, and also to work on a multilateral package. We have agreed—but no one else has yet agreed—but it is necessary to establish some kind of coordination office in Moscow, so that it will be verified that, first, all of us in the G-7 do what we have promised to do, on time, without delays, and second, so that our actions are coordinated within Russia itself, so that we are not in conflict with each other and so the aid goes where it is supposed to. We devoted much time to the question of introducing this. As regards the second question, we have discussed Jackson-Vanik and CEMA and other issues. And I told President Yeltsin that at my meetings with Congress before I came here, we agreed. Some members of Congress from both parties showed interest in this. We drew up a list of all the legislative limitations which had been worked out during the second war [as heard] and which we apply to Russia, although Russia is a democratic state. I have listened to President Yeltsin on this issue and I will return home and will introduce the largest number of possible amendments as regards this Jackson-Vanik legislation.

And then I will examine whether there are people who are not allowed to emigrate. The president said no. I will discuss this issue with Congress and also the CEMA issue. In a few days we will be able to offer the U.S. press and public a comprehensive answer on the administration's position, and we will examine this.

[IZVESTIYA correspondent] IZVESTIYA newspaper. My question is to Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Clinton. Here it is: Should restrictions on trade with Russia be lifted—this may become a first sign of establishing relations of partnership, those very relations which have long been talked about. I would like to ask you, gentlemen, which specific areas, priority areas, can you name which would allow us to state that partnership is going ahead? Mr. Clinton, what is your opinion: Are there areas in which the United States of America would be interested in cooperating with Russian businesses? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Let me answer the first question. On the first question, I would like to say that we discussed, yesterday and today, about 50 issues. Practically all those issues had to do with partnership. We would not have managed to resolve any issue at all were we not partners, and if we treated each other as adversaries or potential enemies. No, we are partners, we are future allies, and that is how we are building our relations, that is how our negotiations developed, that is how we tackled all practical issues. Of some 50 questions which we discussed, not a single one dropped out of sight: Either they were resolved on the spot, or relevant bodies were instructed to resolve them in the near future.

[Clinton] I would also like to answer this question. I will reply to what President Yeltsin has said. The areas which, in the opinion of the United States, hold promise are: power engineering, outer space, the environment, nuclear security—these are some of the areas in which we could cooperate in a way which would be economically beneficial for Russia in the short term, and would

also be useful for the United States. Besides, we discussed, but have not decided upon, a whole range of possible projects which could be developed in order to move things on and make private investment more attractive, for market economy is formed on the basis of private capital investment rather than public capital investments.

The second thing I would like to mention in reply to President Yeltsin's comment is: We discussed a whole range of issues, and, in all fairness, more that we had expected. We did not reach agreement on every single one—one cannot expect leaders of major states to reach agreement over all issues. We agreed on how to tackle these issues, how to work on the basis of differences. I was appreciative of President Yeltsin's extreme frankness within the framework of our conversations, in particular in those areas where we still have some blanks, in terms of our position.

[Correspondent] Two questions, one for each of the presidents. Your representative, Stephanopoulos, drew attention to irritants in the relations between Russia and the United States concerning the presence of submarines. What have you agreed to do in order to prevent such collisions? There are still old habits which it is difficult to get rid of. And how can the presence of the submarines be prevented? How do you intend to solve the problem of withdrawing troops from the Latvian and Baltic states and eastern Europe? Are you prepared to withdraw them as soon as possible?

[Clinton] I will answer first. I can say what I said to President Yeltsin, that I regret the incident with the submarines, and I have ordered a careful and thorough investigation of the incident in order to establish that it was not done deliberately. When the inquiry into the case is complete I will invite Russia to discuss the question, and whether policy is to be changed accordingly. We can only regret it, and we hope that it will not happen again. Over to you.

[Yeltsin] I would like to add a couple of words on the first question: We agreed that at the end of May or the beginning of June, Grachev, the Russian defense minister, will make an official visit to the United States, and he will discuss the full spectrum of military technical issues, including the monitoring of submarine movements, so that there will be no more of these incidents.

Regarding the withdrawal of troops from the Baltic republics: We are precisely implementing the schedule which we signed on the withdrawal of troops from Lithuania, and we are coming to the end of the withdrawal, as Lithuania is not violating human rights and is treating the Russian-speaking population with respect. If Estonia and Latvia violate human rights, if they have made their legislation in such a way that the ethnic minorities find themselves persecuted, Russians mainly, then while we have adopted the decision as a whole to withdraw troops from these republics, we will link the schedule to the way in which they tackle the human rights issue.

[ITAR-TASS correspondent] ITAR-TASS. I have a question for President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and for President Clinton. Boris Nikolayevich, you have said that Bill Clinton's economic package lays a foundation for partnership between Russia and the United States, and at the same time gives a strong impetus to the acceleration of reforms in Russia. In April, there will be a referendum in Russia. Speaking from Vancouver today, and judging from the accords and documents signed on Canadian soil, what is your forecast about the development of the situation?

And now a question for Mr. Clinton: Mr. President, personal factors play a major part in politics; Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has just spoken about this. Tell us please, what can you add about your impressions and feelings from your bilateral relations with Boris Nikolayevich, and about the personal factor in this matter? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] With regard to the referendum, that is our internal matter. Whether it will have an indirect effect or not is a different question. But it is for us to decide on the questions for the referendum; it is for us to work with the population; it is for us to persuade the people of Russia that if they do not give a vote of confidence on 25 April it will be a severe blow not only to Russia but also to the United States and other countries. This will mean a loss of democracy, loss of freedom; this will mean slipping back many decades; this will be a return to the communist yoke, which is unacceptable.

[Clinton] Personally, as regards President Yeltsin and our meeting, he is the man I imagined, a man of modest origins, who does not forget his roots. Second, his wisdom consists of the fact that he trusts the Russian people. Courage in a democracy comes down to needing to trust the people. Even if the people decide to remove you, Boris Yeltsin has placed all his hope, and the Russian Government, in the hands of the Russian people. This is unique in history. There are few states in the world which have the spirit, culture, and riches of the Russian people. These are the Russian people who were never able to control their destiny. But now he trusts all the people who live in the 12 time zones of Russia. This is very good.

Next please.

[Correspondent] (?KIRO) television, Seattle. Mr. President and Mr. President, we are interested in the following: Is there any part of the package which would involve Russia's Far East and the northwest of the United States, with regard to the economic development and people-to-people relations, inter alia?

[Clinton] Yes, we agreed to considerably expand people-to-people exchanges, in particular those people who we would like to bring into our country: Business people,

students; we would like to have exchanges in the cultural area and in other fields, which we are yet to decide upon. However, I would say that it is very easy to minimize everything, in particular when long-haul projects are being considered. However, not a single person living during the second half of this century can conceal the significance of the exchange between the two countries. I worked with Senator Fulbright, who set up a special exchange program which carries his name. This allowed the establishment of contacts with many countries. And I will do my utmost to have exchanges increased considerably. In this respect, we are undoubtedly being supported by the U.S. Congress.

[Yeltsin] Just a few words. In this package, which I must say is a very comprehensive and wise package, one which will make history, there is one other question: This is assistance to northern minorities on Russia's territory. This is extremely important.

[Correspondent] I would like to know what your main feelings are. Everyone wants to help you, because you represent democracy. But after you, is there an alternative? And if there is an alternative to President Yeltsin, maybe President Clinton should think about what he should do if you do not win in the referendum.

[Yeltsin] First I want to say that I will do all I can, and that I hope and believe that the Russian people will make their choice on 25 April. Today, and I mean today, there is no alternative to Yeltsin. There will be one tomorrow, but not today.

[Clinton] I would have made a similar statement if I were facing a referendum. The answer to your question is simple. I have indicated quite clearly that the United States is pursuing the aims of democracy, of human rights, of modern economy, of reducing the nuclear threat, of observing the sovereignty of other new independent states. We have interests and values, and they are embodied in the policy pursued by President Yeltsin. He is the legally elected president of Russia, and I will work with him as long as he retains this post. And I would not like these values to be replaced by any others.

[Correspondent Rostov] Rostov, the "Vesti" program. Our microphones are partially working, partially not, so... I have a question to the Russian president. The total sum of aid about which you have spoken is not such a large one. For example, when there were disturbances in Los Angeles, twice as much aid was allocated as that which we are talking about now. That is, the question is how effectively these projects will be carried out. Which projects do you think will give results straightaway and which will be the most effective from the point of view of social influence?

[Yeltsin] Yes, I think that there is no need for hyped-up, astronomic figures. They are more hype than reality. These are real figures which can be implemented, which we need.

[Rostov] But what projects do you think will be the most effective?

[Yeltsin] The first priority is fuel, which will allow us to obtain hard currency. This means the oil and gas industry. The renewal of the oil and gas industry, and we talked about this in particular. The next issue is the immediate delivery, now, of goods for the people.

[Correspondent] I have a double question, one for President Clinton, one for President Yeltsin. Hispanic-speaking members of Congress have asked that the construction of the Cienfuegos enterprise in Cuba be discontinued. Mr. Yeltsin, do you have a schedule for withdrawing Soviet, Russian, troops from Cuba?

[Clinton] First I want to say that the subsidies sent by Russia to Cuba have been halted. Trade between Russia and Cuba is conducted on the basis of the market. A nuclear power station is under construction there; this concerns America, the United States. We have expressed our concern, and this was touched upon.

[Yeltsin] We have already begun the withdrawal of troops. And now we are defining more precisely the schedule for a final withdrawal of troops.

[Correspondent] So you have not taken any obligations upon yourself?

[Yeltsin] Not yet.

[SEGODNYA correspondent] SEGODNYA newspaper. A question for President Clinton: Mr. President, one can already predict that President Yeltsin's opponents will undoubtedly accuse him of making certain unilateral political concessions to the United States in exchange for the Clinton package. Maybe we can forestall them and answer that question now? Thank you.

[Clinton] I do not believe that one can say in all fairness that President Yeltsin has made political concessions in exchange for the U.S. package. We have clarified some of our positions, and that has made a pleasant and positive impression on me. But at our private meetings we have always adhered to our own points of view, and I have seen that President Yeltsin has adhered to his.

And the United States has also taken steps which have nothing to do with financial resources, attempting to reinforce the fact that we consider this as a partnership between two major states. That is how we want to work, and I have agreed to examine all questions, including the consequences of the Cold War. I emphasized to the president how much I regret the incident with the submarines, and I intend to review the policy on this question after my return. If such assertions are made, it would be unjust. [sentence as heard]

[Yeltsin] I am not afraid of reproaches by the opposition, since I do not see a single hitch which it might be able to seize on. There are no such issues in these documents and these accords.

Shokhin Comments on Summit Aid Package Benefits

LD0504111493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1048 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Borovkov]

[Text] Petropavlovsk-Kamchatski April 5 TASS—Granting of U.S. aid to Russia is not the main economic result of the Vancouver summit. It is more important that Russia has for the first time stated that it wants to be an equal partner, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin told reporters on Monday during a stop-over in Kamchatka on his way back to Moscow from Vancouver.

"The main item that we discussed was the Russian access to world markets, including that of uranium and commercial launches of satellites, according to Shokhin who added that Russian public opinion should be aware of that and not boil down the summit results to 1.6 billion dollars of aid. [quotation marks as received]

"I believe that the discussion of issues connected with granting Russia a possibility to earn by itself thanks to the lifting of discriminatory Cocom [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] and tariff limitations and thus allowing it to get out of the difficult economic situation - this is the main thing which was in the centre of the summit attention", Shokhin said.

While speaking about the U.S. package of aid one should not concentrate on its volume, according to the vice-premier.

700 Million dollars out of the 1.6 billion package comprise credits for grain purchases, Shokhin recalled, adding that U.S. President Bill Clinton had asked the Russian leadership to say which support Russians think is necessary for their reforms.

Shokhin reiterated the statement of President Boris Yeltsin that nobody can help Russia, but Russians themselves. However, he added that Western support is necessary in the crucial and pain-staking transition period to a market economy.

Sees Influence on Debt Restructuring

OW0504113393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1102 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia's Vice-Premier Aleksandr Shokhin believes the Russo-American summit in Vancouver has crucially influenced the Paris Club's posture on restructuring the foreign debt of Russia. In an exclusive with an INTERFAX [IF] special correspondent, the vice-premier, who had arrived in Vancouver from Paris, said, "it is debt deferment (Russia will repay only about $3 Bn [billion] to its foreign creditors this year—IF) that will give the country relief, essential for the start of economic stabilization".

More than that, Mr. Shokhin is sure that the London Club will follow Paris' example, which will save Russia $22-25 Bn this year. These debts, in Mr. Shokhin's words, "will go beyond the current millennium". The vice-premier believes that the negotiations due to open in Paris and London late this year will favorably settle the question of Russia's debt for next year.

"They wanted so much the initiative to stem from the Paris Club that I was escorted to the plane for Vancouver by police so that I wouldn't miss it," Shokhin joked and added that "the package of world aid to Russia agreed in Vancouver would increasingly affect the pace of economic stabilization in the country".

Germany's Kinkel Assesses Summit Results

LD0504170993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1627 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy]

[Text] Bonn April 5 TASS—The meeting of U.S. and Russian Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin in Vancouver took place in the crucial moment of reforms in Russia. It highlighted common interest in the success of the restructuring drive in Russia, German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel said in Bonn today evaluating the Vancouver summit.

"I welcome the American President's determination to give partner backing to politicians who are ready to push forward reforms in the Russian Federation," he said.

In the run-up to the meeting with Yeltsin, the U.S. President rightly drew the attention of his fellow citizens to the fact that it is time for America to act. The success of renewal in Russia should be a priority goal also for Americans. This is investment in the future rather than charity, Kinkel observed. All industrialised Western states bear their share of responsibility for this. The main efforts in enacting reforms should be taken, however, by Russia itself, Kinkel emphasized.

Media Comment on Outcome of Vancouver Summit

'New Landmark' in Relations

LD0504161393 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 0730 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Excerpts] We begin this bulletin with a report about an event which we all looked forward to with hope. Our expectations were, it seems, justified. The Russo-U.S. summit has successfully ended in Canada. Our special correspondent Viktor Levin reports from Vancouver:

[Levin] Meetings between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and other heads of state have become the norm, and it is silly to expect sensational results from all of them. Such meetings are not an end in themselves, but a means to an end. Taking this point of view, one can therefore say with certainty that the Vancouver meeting

was a new landmark in the development of Russo-U.S. relations, marking the start of genuine partnership. [passage omitted]

Of course, one can assess the strength and power of a state in different ways. It is one thing to see it in terms of over-arming. It is quite another to see it in terms of providing a high standard of living for citizens and a reliable system of social welfare. The path to over-arming led Russia and the United States to a blind alley from which it is difficult to get out, although the degree of difficulty is different for us and them. But it is only with the end of the arms race, which exhausted and bled resources dry, that the path to solving social and economic problems has opened up. As the Vancouver meeting has shown, Russia and the United States want to and intend to cooperate in this.

Opponents of the Russian president will undoubtedly say: $1.6 billion worth of support, so what? Yes, it is not a large sum. But, first, it will be used for very specific purposes, such as medicine and so on. Second, I would look on the U.S. economic package—Boris Nikolayevich called it Bill Clinton's economic package—as the tip of the iceberg of accord. During these talks, the Russian side clearly raised the question of the necessity of canceling the discriminatory restrictions on trade with Russia which were introduced during the cold war. [passage omitted]

For the first time after many years of the cold war, we are also paving the way for the rebirth of military cooperation. It has been announced that Russian Defense Minister General Grachev will visit the United States at the end of May. As I understand it, the aim is to get rid of problems left over from the Cold War which still make their presence felt, such as the recent collision between American and Russia submarines. [passage omitted]

The presidents of Russia and the United States became friends in Vancouver. And this is of benefit to the peoples of Russia and the United States, and of the whole world as well.

Summit Termed 'Successful'

LD0504192493 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Commentary by Sergey Sayenko]

[Text] Presidents Boris Yeltsin of Russia and Bill Clinton of the United States met in the Canadian city of Vancouver on the third and fourth of this month. A back glance by Sergey Sayenko of Radio Moscow:

As everyone agrees, that was the first economic meeting between a Russian and U.S. president. Previous bilateral summits focused primarily on the dismantling of structures created in the cold war period. In Vancouver, said President Clinton, a foundation has been laid for a new and democratic partnership between the United States and Russia. There is no doubt that the summit helped build a good personal relationship between the Russian and U.S. presidents which may come to play an essential role in bilateral relations, since Bill Clinton has just assumed office and his Russian counterpart can hardly be expected to leave office of his own will soon, even though the Russian people will vote confidence in their president on the 25th of this month.

Some analysts feel the summit helped President Yeltsin to consolidate his position in the run-up to the plebiscite now that he is returning from Vancouver with a package of specific projects of aid to his reform. The Clinton aid package worth $1.6 billion refutes allegations that Washington does not want Russia to flourish and be strong. In an interview with the ABC network, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev has stressed it's essential that the Russians feel they are not alone in the world and that the United States and other democracies will be acting as their reliable allies in efforts to cope with their problems.

The aid package, however, is not the most important result of the Vancouver summit. A joint declaration says the joint efforts to lay a foundation for a new and democratic partnership between Russia and the United States has contributed to global stability. The two presidents decided to do their utmost to avert the spread of mass destruction weapons and their carriers, enforce, as soon as possible, the provisions of the first treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, and have their legislatures ratify START II.

Even though it's keeping quiet about it, the United States is interested, as much as anyone, in the end of confrontation with Russia and the expansion of bilateral relations in all fields. It's no secret that even such a rich country as the United States feels the burden of the arms race. Experts say that over the years of the cold war, the United States spent $4 trillion on the arms race. President Clinton is convinced that the U.S. economy can profit from the reduction of defense spending. The reduction of defense spending can, in his view, reduce the budget deficit and this is exactly what he has pledged to achieve. Both national leaders and their countries can thus regard the Vancouver summit as successful.

Yeltsin, Clinton Take 'Risks'

LD0504215393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Commentary by Svanidze; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] President Clinton announced at the Vancouver summit that Russia will receive $1.6 billion. This ranges from credits for purchasing grain to housing construction for servicemen. However, the main result of the talks was, undoubtedly, the Vancouver declaration, a political document on the principles of relations between the United States and Russia. Their aim is established: It is Russia's harmonious integration in the commonwealth of democratic countries and the world economy, with G-7 support. Russian-U.S. cooperation will receive

a new impulse in every sphere, from politics to technology and environmental protection. The Vancouver declaration stresses the importance of human rights, including the rights of ethnic Russians on the territory of the former USSR. Russia and the United States consider themselves partners in the name of democracy, security, and peace, which is the main idea of the Vancouver declaration.

[Svanidze] Each of the two presidents took some risks in Vancouver. Young Clinton—like John Kennedy—has decided to give a shot of fresh blood to U.S. foreign policy and make a move from words of compassion and empathy with democratic transformations in Russia to practical, specifically targeted economic aid. What is more, in spite of the unambiguous warning from Khasbulatov made last Thursday [1 April] at a meeting with diplomats, Clinton has by personal example invited other Western powers to support Yeltsin as the sole guarantor of the Russian reforms, before it is too late. The U.S. President has, in essence, burned his bridges by placing his bets on the Russian president.

As for Yeltsin, he has demonstrated firmness in regard to his enemies at home. On the eve of the referendum, the president has refrained from the populist temptation to talk to Clinton in a gravely patriotic manner. He has consiously exposed himself to nationalists who declare Western aid a humiliation. Besides, Yeltsin cannot gain any tactical advantages from his friendship with Clinton. The West is not in a position to influence the outcome of the power struggle in Russia. However, long-term economic and strategic Russian interests are unthinkable without Russia's integration in the civilized world community. This is why Yeltsin's risk is justified.

Movement Toward Practical Cooperation

LD0604101893 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0830 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The Vancouver summit marks a new era in the history of Russo-American relations. That is the conclusion reached by U.S. observers. Over to our correspondent in the United States, Boris Kalyagin:

[Kalyagin] This is the first summit of the leaders of the two countries which focused attention on economic issues and not on problems of global confrontation or national security and disarmament. Defense ministers who used to be necessary participants of all Russo-U.S. talks stayed home this time. They were replaced by finance ministers. The United States has put forward a new program for economic aid to Russia, having increased it to $1.6 billion: $700 million are earmarked for concessional grain sales, $224 million will be provided in the form of goods and medicines, and $95 million will fund the privatization of state enterprises. At the same time, none of the allocations will need any special endorsement by the U.S. Congress and can be used immediately. As stressed by President Clinton, at issue is not aid but long-term partnership.

The latest meeting confirmed that Russia and the United States are moving from political understanding to actual practical cooperation. That is why the issue of lifting all restrictions on trade with Russia, which we inherited from the cold war, was raised. President Clinton promised to abolish, with the help of the U.S. Congress, these restrictive rules. The head of the White House pledged to reconsider the military and political decisions which led to a U.S. submarine's colliding with a Russian submarine. That is also a sign of growing trust and of restructuring in relations between our countries. President Clinton stressed once more that the U.S. is firmly supporting the policy of democratic reforms and of Russia moving to a market economy, as well as the architect of that policy—President Yeltsin.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on Military Topics

PM0504191593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 pp 1, 3

[Mikhail Pogorelyy report: "The United States and Russia: Yesterday—Rivals. Today—Partners. Tomorrow—Allies? Vancouver Meeting Opens New Stage in Russian-U.S. Relations"]

[Text] The meeting between the Russian and U.S. presidents in the Canadian city of Vancouver began with Bill Clinton's expression of... regret over the recent incident in the Barents Sea in which a U.S. Navy submarine collided with a Russian submarine. This was a minor episode at the summit ,but it is really very characteristic and demonstrates the sides' sincere desire to seek and find mutual understanding in areas where just yesterday there was clear confrontation and a war of nerves. Almost immediately the presidents agreed that in late May or early June Army General Pavel Grachev, Russian defense minister, will visit the United States and discuss questions of military cooperation between our two countries with the Pentagon leadership.

During the talks the sides also broached other aspects of military policy, but the general tenor and tone of the meeting were completely new. Whereas previously at such summits the structures of the strong-arm confrontation between the "two worlds" and "two systems" were dismantled, this time the bases and foundation of new relations between the world's two largest powers were laid. That foundation is economic.

In two days of work the presidents managed to discuss over 50 different questions. Undoubtedly the most significant of those questions was "Bill Clinton's" economic "package," envisaging measures of support for the program of Russian reforms. For the first time it is planned to allocate not just abstract millions for the "support of democracy": This time it is a question of subsidizing specific projects and furthermore there is a precise schedule for the allocation of that money—by 25 April, in May, in September, and so forth. There is another "first time" here. For the first time these dollar

investments will go directly to producers and entrepreneurs, bypassing the numerous bureaucratic structures which have recently gotten fairly rich out of generous overseas gifts.

This aspect—the tangibility of Western support—was repeatedly stressed at the final press conference at the end of the talks by Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton. In the short term, they noted, each Russian will be able to appreciate the multimillion contribution to health care and the considerable help with medicines plus supplies of consumer goods. No less important are investments totalling $1.6 billion. They are being directed first and foremost into developing the fuel and energy complex. Why there precisely? The answer is simple. Today this is one of the few spheres where we really can earn hard currency quickly—surely we all remember that we all lived quite well while the "petrodollars" jingled in our state's pocket.

I should like to mention the scale of the financial assistance. Some journalists expressed astonishment at the inadequate sounding amount, not even $2 billion. President Yeltsin replied to them that the figure is indeed not fantastic. That is good because it is realistic. It will not go the same way as those tens of billions of dollars that were promised to the former Soviet leadership but did not exist except on the front pages of the press. President Clinton for his part noted that, in the first place, this is only the first part of the package of economic support for the reforms in Russia. The second part will be equally substantial. In addition, on his return to Washington he intends to meet with congressional leaders and raise with them the question of reviewing a number of discriminatory legislative acts like the notorious Jackson-Vanik amendment and others which raised great obstacles to the development of economic and trade relations with our country back in the cold war days.

Second, even a fabulously wealthy country like America cannot singlehandedly tackle such a task as supporting Russia in the difficult period of changing its socioeconomic formation, moving toward a radically new system of production and distribution, and forming market relations within the country and in relations with the rest of the world. In this connection the U.S. President has sent a message to the heads of states and government of the "G-7" countries in which he suggested to the most industrially developed nations that they follow America's lead and establish direct bilateral contacts of a similar sort with the Russian leadership. If I have correctly understood Clinton's plan, what he means is that each of the "G-7" states should in some way sponsor individual sectors of the Russian economy. The United States is undertaking to assist the development of the fuel and energy complex, cosmonautics and space research, ensuring the safety of nuclear reactors, and help in establishing the private farming sector in Russian agriculture. In addition, it should not be forgotten that the Americans, as our main rivals in the past and main partners at all the talks, bear a certain burden of help in our fulfillment of our nuclear disarmament commitments: This process, it has been noted many times, is pretty costly.

Other problems facing our Armed Forces were not forgotten during the Vancouver meeting either. They relate not only to armaments but to human lives. Through its President, the United States declared its intention to join in the assistance which so far only Germany has actually provided, namely assistance in financing housing construction for servicemen: It also declared its readiness to take part in organizing retraining for those military cadres discharged as part of the reduction of the Russian Armed Forces. The United States accumulated considerable and very valuable experience in this sphere after World War II, as well as in the transition to the contractual principle of military recruitment. The military theme in the Russian-U.S. dialogue will continue in detail during the talks between the two countries' defense ministers. But today it has been announced that $6 million have been allocated for the construction of 450 apartment blocks for servicemen returning to Russia in the next 12-16 months.

Summarizing all these questions, the Russian president noted that this whole policy is aimed at the prosperity of each specific individual—both in Russia and in America, where the "Russian factor" is helping to create new jobs, new orders for enterprises and farms, and so forth. "A policy focused on the actual individual, that is the 'Clinton policy' and the 'Yeltsin policy'," the president said.

It is no coincidence that Boris Yeltsin touched on the problem of the Americans' interest in helping Russia and its reformist forces. Clinton himself repeatedly returned to that theme and stressed: What we are giving is not so much help as support. The United States has an interest in a strong, free, predictable Russia where people will lead rich and happy lives—after all, then they would have something else to lose other than "their chains." Support for Russia is also an investment by America in its own future and security, the U.S. President reiterated. By all accounts, this position is shared by the leaders of the U.S. Congress who, on the eve of the meeting, expressed their approval for Bill Clinton's action program.

Nor did the Vancouver meeting overlook such fairly touchy issues as the linkage of measures of support for Russia with the personal fate of Russian leaders. Yeltsin himself stated that he does not doubt the people's choice and, in reply to a question of confidence in the president and his policy, Bill Clinton stated for his part that his Russian counterpart is a lawfully elected state figure with the corresponding powers. He put it quite diplomatically but "between the lines" you could discern a desire to continue the dialogue with Yeltsin specifically. "There is no alternative to Yeltsin today," the Russian president stated. "Tomorrow there will be but today there is not." It seems that the leaders of the United States and the majority of other Western states agree with that.

The timing of the extraordinary conference of "G-7" foreign and finance ministers in Tokyo 14-15 April is clearly no coincidence: This conference will discuss both Clinton's initiatives and those of the main Western industrialized countries' governments on organizing support for Russia's economic development. At least two countries—Britain and Canada—have already responded to Clinton's appeal and prepared their own "packages" of proposed support for the Russian reforms.

International problems, while not predominant at the present summit, were nevertheless discussed and demonstrated, as President Yeltsin said, that our views coincide on the main matters. This gave him grounds for stating that we are confidently moving from relations of partnership today to the alliance ties of tomorrow. This thought was confirmed by both presidents when they answered a question on mutual concessions in the elaboration of agreements in specific areas. In practice neither side had to make concessions, they both said, bearing in mind the community of positions and interests of both states and both peoples.

Even on those problems where America and Russia still have different approaches to solutions there is understanding and patience. One such problem, in my view, was President Yeltsin's statement on suspending the withdrawal of the Russian troop units from the Baltic states. Evidently the other side's understanding is conditional on the fact that this decision is not an act of imperial arrogance but a well-considered policy and a balanced step aimed at protecting the interests of the Russian population in Latvia and Estonia. Ultimately the concern for human rights, freedoms, and the democratic foundations of social organization have long been among the central areas of U.S. policy—one of U.S. diplomacy's favorite hobby horses...

The presidents also discussed a number of other foreign policy problems. They included the as yet unresolved nuclear question in the former Soviet republics which is still worrying the West. In practice it is the position of Ukraine which is causing the Americans the greatest concern. At the talks the sides discussed not only the fulfillment of the requirements of the START Treaty but other related steps, for example on affiliation to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty initially by Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan and eventually the other republics. They also agreed incidentally on the terms of our sale of weapons-grade uranium to the West—this will enable us to more successfully resolve technical problems of nuclear disarmament.

On the whole President Yeltsin called the Vancouver meeting historic. Bill Clinton agreed with him. In the two leaders' opinion, it opens a new stage and a new era in mutual relations between the world's two largest powers and two states with the greatest influence on the whole of world development. The establishment of relations not of partnership but, as the Russian president noted, of alliance between them can only have the most beneficial impact on the general world political atmosphere.

Yeltsin, Clinton Face 'Uphill Task'

MK0604094693 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Mikhail Karpov article: "Not Aid But Cooperation, Russian, U.S. Presidents Insisted in Vancouver. Remaining Components of the 'Yeltsin-Clinton Doctrine' So Far Not Clear"]

[Excerpts] Emphatic loyalty was probably the main feature of the Vancouver summit. The program for U.S.-Russian cooperation, which sometimes—apparently through inertia—is called the Russian aid program, was accorded by Boris Yeltsin the title of "Bill Clinton's economic package." To which the U.S. President responded: "Yeltsin is behaving like a hero." Andrey Kozyrev spoke in Vancouver about the "Yeltsin-Clinton doctrine." [passage omitted]

One should not walk away with the impression that everything in Vancouver proceeded absolutely smoothly, without a hitch. Clinton, for example, admitted that the presidents did not reach agreement on all points and did not come to terms about everything, but the general outcome of the meeting is, without a doubt, positive. This does not mean at all that the anti-Yeltsin opposition will not find reasons to criticize what has been accomplished in Vancouver. It can be forecast with certainty that everything will be done in order to use the meeting for its own purposes in the approach to the referendum. As is known, whatever the legendary King Midas touched turned to gold. We also know how the opposition tries to present everything that the Russian president touches.

After Vancouver Clinton and Yeltsin will be confronted with a formidable task: to convince their peoples that the meeting will bring them positive results. And both will find it quite an uphill task. It is clear why this is so for Yeltsin, but as for Clinton, this is because only one out of five Americans agrees with his President's wish to help Russia.

Western Aid Prospects Viewed

PM0604104993 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Report by Yuriy Popov: "West Believes in Feasibility of Our Program"]

[Text] Russians are awaiting with strained attention the results of the meeting between the two presidents—B. Yeltsin and B. Clinton. Everyone is perturbed by the question: What will it bring the country? This expectation is entirely understandable.

Indeed, a veritable flood of the most contradictory information about Western aid has descended on Russians at a period before, during, and after the ninth congress. J. Attali, president of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, has suggested writing off the Russian foreign debt. G. Foglizzo, the Moscow

representative of the IMF, gave to understand that the IMF now sees no possibility of helping Russia.

World Bank President L. Preston advocated large-scale aid to our country only if it puts its own economic house in order and curbs inflation. THE FINANCIAL TIMES, on the other hand, has asserted: "Only massive Western aid of $2-3 billion over the next three months would enable the Russian Government to put inflation under control."

In brief, there has been no shortage of plans, doubts, proposals, and opinions. Only one thing has been in short supply—specific actions. It is no accident that a part of the Western press has concluded that, by restricting itself to assurances of support, the West could wait for the reforms in Russia to die, but mere verbal assurances discredit it in the eyes of the Russians.

In literally one week the picture has changed drastically. It is known that the seven largest industrially developed countries together with international financial organizations have decided rapidly to elaborate a large-scale program of support for our reforms. According to some figures it will be $30 billion. Financial aid alone is assessed at $12 billion. The prelude to this was the summit meeting in Vancouver. During the meeting the United States earmarked $1.6 billion. That is merely the first specific contribution from America. In a little while Washington has intended to make public several more specific programs. It is planned to channel 75 percent of the overall program into aid for individual Russian cities, not including Moscow, and to nongovernment organizations.

In the West the U.S. step is viewed as a political signal which says that the United States and the other leading Western states are prepared to support in practice the transformations in Russia. Here are just a few pieces of evidence of this. Canada has announced that it has earmarked an additional 200 million dollars for these purposes. The European Bank of Reconstruction and Development has expressed the readiness to invest $1.5 billion in our economy in 1993. The Paris Club of 19 countries that are Russia's main creditors has announced an unprecedented decision: Despite the fact that talks with Ukraine are not completed, the club has granted a 10-year deferment for the payment of about $15 billion of the slightly more than $17 billion which we should have paid this year.

And so it may be said with confidence that the West is shifting from promises to real actions distinguished by one important feature. In no case is it a matter of largess or indulgence to a poor country unable to pay its debts or which has agreed to sell its national interests off cheaply. On the contrary, these actions attest to the West's new turn toward Russia as an equal, strong partner with which it counts on establishing mutually advantageous trade and economic relations. That was particularly emphasized during the meeting between B. Yeltsin and B. Clinton.

West Sees Role as 'Business Partner'

PM0604105693 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Pavel Shinkarenko report: "Economic Cooperation Replacing Ideological Confrontation: Alliance With Russian Reform"]

[Text] The talks between the presidents of Russia and the United States proved to be unique in many respects. This was, moreover, Boris Yeltsin's first personal meeting with Bill Clinton as the official head of the U.S. Administration. Other details are equally important. Just before his trip to Vancouver Bill Clinton had businesslike conversations with the heads of state and government of many leading Western countries, while Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney personally took part in the talks. One can say therefore that the U.S. President expressed the opinion of not just the White House but the whole Western world.

That being so, the political support for the Russian reforms which the Russian president was given across the ocean acquires even greater value. That value is not, of course, to be measured by the $1.6 billion allocated by the United States or the $200 million promised by Canada, Nor even by the larger sum which Russia may also obtain from the other G-7 countries and the international financial institutions—the IMF and the World Bank. As is well known, foreign and finance ministers are assembling in Tokyo 14-15 April especially to tackle this question. A high-powered Russian delegation has been invited to the conference.

The main thing is that the Vancouver meeting showed that the West believes in the future of the political and economic transformations in our country and is ready to see Russia not through the cross hairs of a gun sight but as a business partner and, possibly, a likely ally. Therein lies the main result of Boris Yeltsin's trip across the ocean.

Of course the Russian-U.S. Declaration and the package of economic agreements adopted in Vancouver can, if you like, be regarded as a "protocol of intent." The West expects the supreme authorities and all the people of Russia to express themselves in favor of a definitive break with the totalitarian past, not just in words, but in deeds. We will be offered such an opportunity on 25 April, the day of the Russia-wide referendum. By supporting the course of reforms through the nationwide vote Russians will instruct the president, the government, and parliament to advance along the path of forming a civilized, rule-of-law society. And although the upcoming referendum is Russia's internal affair, its results could be momentous for the whole world community. If the people toe the opposition's line and "refuse to give a vote of confidence to the present government, that will deal a heavy blow against not just the course of reforms and Russia, but the United States too," Boris Yeltsin stressed at the final press conference.

Nevertheless, American aid is designed to run not for one or two years but decades. Capital investments are therefore made not in a specific individual, but in the process of reforms as a whole. However, in Bill Clinton's words, Boris Yeltsin is the president of Russia elected by all the people and most consistently embodies the course of democratic transformations, therefore Washington and the other countries of the West do pin their hopes on him.

The Vancouver summit meeting was a major world event. The referendum will show whether Russia picks up the baton.

'Realism' of Aid Package Hailed

PM0604110493 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 93 First Edition pp 1,3

[Vasiliy Kononenko and Aleksandr Shalnev report: "B. Yeltsin Returns From Vancouver With Concrete and Realistic Program of Aid for Russian Reforms"]

[Text] Vancouver—"There is no alternative to Yeltsin today. Tomorrow there will be, but there is none today," the Russian president said in Vancouver, and in this he had the full backing of U.S. President William Clinton, as borne out by the results of the two-day Russian-U.S. summit in this Canadian city.

Immediately before Boris Yeltsin got into the automobile to go to the airport, Clinton shook his hand and wished him "Victory!" There is certainly no need to explain what the U.S. President meant.

His wishes were backed up by actions. Although both presidents noted that Russia's upcoming referendum is, to use Boris Yeltsin's words, "an internal question of ours," everyone realizes that had the Russian president returned to Moscow empty-handed or with promises for the "long term," his political positions could have been considerably undermined ahead of the crucial test.

Yeltsin is not returning empty-handed. And it is by no means solely a question of the Russian reform aid program that was made public in Vancouver and which is primarily impressive by virtue of its realism and promptness: According to the White House, this program worth a total of $1.6 billion could be enacted "today." Its realism resides in the fact that, unlike the previous program announced by the Bush administration a year ago, it is clearly tied to specific sectors and, more importantly, to dates: For instance, by 25 April such-and-such should have been done, by 27 April such-and-such, and so on for 1 May, June, October, etc.

The main provisions of this program, which the Russian president called the "Clinton package," are as follows:

free humanitarian aid totaling $690 million, $224 million of which is intended for buying food and medical supplies;

loans of $700 million to buy U.S. food, loans provided on exceptionally favorable terms to be repaid in installments over 15 years, with six to seven years deferral of repayment;

appropriations for Russia's privatization program ($95 million) and to stimulate private enterprise ($50 million);

the construction of 450 model homes for servicemen being withdrawn from Eastern Europe and the Baltic (the White House announced that those areas where the local authorities are "committed to market-oriented economic reforms" will be given preference when choosing a site for the construction, due to take a year to 16 months);

the attainment of an agreement that a deal will be concluded by 14 April at the latest whereby the U.S. Export-Import Bank will allocate $2 billion in credit for the development of Russia's oil and gas industry;

the creation of a joint commission cochaired by Viktor Chernomyrdin and U.S. Vice President Albert Gore on technological cooperation in the sphere of power generation and space.

At the same time the U.S. President agreed to secure the speediest and effective abolition of restrictions and barriers inherited from the "cold war" that are preventing our technologies and commodities from gaining access to the highly wealthy U.S. market. In response to IZVESTIYA's question, Bill Clinton —who incidentally make an unprecedented gesture in holding a separate press conference specially for Russian journalists, causing some dissatisfaction among U.S. journalists— expressed confidence that, by acting in conjunction with the Congress, he would be able to secure—in the near future—the abolition of many of these restrictions. On the other hand, the U.S. President did admittedly indicate that the COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] bans would only be abolished gradually, in stages, and that this process might prove none too short-lived.

Be that as it may, literally this month or next Russia and the United States will sign a contract that should bring us at least $10 billion, a contract to supply the United States with enriched uranium. According to our information, the U.S. side was forced to make extremely substantial concessions in order for this contract to become possible and in particular to radically moderate its requests as regards the size of the commission that the Energy Department, for instance, would receive for its assistance in selling Russian uranium to private U.S. companies.

In view of this and other similar factors, it is hard to disagree with Boris Yeltsin when he said at the final press conference: "I am not afraid of recriminations from the opposition. I do not see a single snag in our agreements that the opposition could seize on."

Admittedly, it cannot be ruled out that snags might come to light in the U.S. Congress: Opening up U.S. markets to our technologies—missile, nuclear, and space technologies—is not giving the U.S. companies involved in these businesses cause for any particular delight; these are companies which are themselves currently faced with all the horrors of "defense conversion" and which would of course like protection against unwanted competitors. They will primarily look for that protection to the Congress, which will have to ratify the White House decisions abolishing the restrictions.

We think that the inclusion in the text of the joint declaration of a fairly lengthy paragraph touching on human rights in the former Soviet republics constitutes a political advantage for the Russian president. Although these republics were not mentioned specifically, it is not difficult to figure out who is meant—the Baltic countries, where the rights of the Russian-speaking population are being flouted. It is worthy of note that the declaration includes this paragraph underlining the need for "full protection of civil rights" and does so virtually on the initiative of the United States itself, for whom the Baltics have always been a special case, an object of particular affection.

Boris and Bill now have "special relations." That at any rate was what the Russian president said, and the U.S. President did not object to the expression. According to B. Yeltsin "we found a common language in Vancouver, since we are both men of action and to some extent idealists."

'Undue Hopes' Misplaced

PM0604105793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 3

[Feature on Vancouver summit comprising comment by Viktor Linnik entitled "Ten Dollars for a Russian Soul" and report by Vladimir Drobkov entitled "What Will the Response to Vancouver Be?"]

[Text] **Ten Dollars for a Russian Soul**

That is how much Yeltsin managed to get from Clinton in two days of talks in Vancouver. That is less than the price of a bottle of whiskey. Furthermore, two-thirds of that amount will have to be given back to America—either by us or our children. For comparison's sake, the Jews in Israel receive $700 per head from the United States. That surely is all the comment needed on the theme of American generosity and the tumultuous era of "partnership and cooperation" between Russia and the United States.

I do not mean to criticize America: Ultimately each country has its own list of friends and order of priorities. In our case we are looking at the bankruptcy of Kozyrev's foreign policy concept. For 18 months they fed us fairy tales about the inevitable "shower of gold" from the West for Yeltsin's reforms. The reality, as PRAVDA asserted from the very outset, is far more grim.

The Vancouver meeting really was historic: It officially enshrined the inequality of Russia and the United States. We go around with our hand outstretched: The West frowns and gives us something as an act of kindness.

The torrent of private capital investments has yet to appear. Foreign private companies have invested in Russia with a population of 150 million less than a quarter the amount they have invested in socialist Vietnam with its population of 70 million.

What Will the Response to Vancouver Be?

Washington, 5 Apr—The meeting between B. Clinton and B. Yeltsin in the Canadian city of Vancouver has ended. It seemed to me that the American participants, for all their expressions of sympathy for Boris Nikolayevich personally, tried to avoid becoming unduly and overtly involved in the internal disputes currently taking place in Russia. Did it work? Hardly. President Clinton, while paying his respects to his partner, increasingly often spoke about support not just for Yeltsin but for all "reforms and reformers" in Russia. Special envoy S. Talbott felt obliged to state that the present U.S. Administration "is not interested solely in supporting one government at any one time" but wants to elaborate a policy designed for long-term cooperation with Russia.

The hosts of the meeting made considerable effort to enhance the Russian president's prestige. They accorded him every honor due on such occasions.

Some observers believe that this was why on day one of the talks the presidents speaking "as equals" recalled the contentious problems of Russian-U.S. relations.

What are the "bare bones" of the Vancouver talks?

First of all observers here are highlighting the importance which the Russian president himself and his American interlocutor attached to the strengthening of Yeltsin's "waning power and prestige" in his own country, as THE WASHINGTON POST put it. According to the POST, Yeltsin himself and his aides made every effort to portray his two-day absence from Russia as presenting no threat to his prestige. The Vancouver meeting was an important "opportunity for Clinton to "show the flag" too because he has run into difficult problems in Congress and, according to a recent public opinion poll, has lost ground among a considerable number of recent supporters. Both presidents, according to THE NEW YORK TIMES, needed the meeting to assert their leadership.

Among the more significant results of the Vancouver meeting I would note the accord that the presidents reached on expanding U.S. aid to Russia to $1.6 billion.

This "expansion" was achieved mainly by granting Russia new credits to buy U.S. grain to the tune of $700 million. I would recall that we already owed the Americans around $600 million for grain shipments and the old "line of credit" was closed for us. By means of some

financial manipulations the U.S. Administration is offering Russia a new credit despite the old, unpaid debts. A noble gesture, of course, but as USA TODAY rightly notes, this help is given more to America's farmers than to Russia.

Apart from offering a new credit, Clinton intends "immediately" making available to Russia the money already set aside by the previous administration and approved by the legislators on Capitol Hill.

As for really new appropriations, the U.S. President promised to "consult with Congress" once more and address the G-7 states as well. Then they will all put forward an all-embracing plan of assistance for Russia...

Nor was there a "breakthrough" in the sphere of repealing the discriminatory "amendments" and restrictions influencing U.S. trade with Russia. Even though Yeltsin hastened to state at the press conference that he and Clinton "agreed" on this, the U.S. President merely promised to ask Congress to review the decisions of the "Cold War" era.

It is already clear now that any increase in aid to Russia will be extremely difficult to force through Congress, which is demanding a reduction in appropriations for assistance to foreign states so as to reduce the budget deficit and help needy Americans. It is noteworthy that according to a poll conducted on the eve of Vancouver, the vast majority of Americans believe that Russia has already been given sufficient help. Americans are opposed to new appropriations. According to the findings of a recent poll here, around 80 percent of those questioned stated that they do not support extra help for the Russian "reformers."

According to yet another poll conducted recently by THE NEW YORK TIMES and CBS TV, only 29 percent of Americans support "giving economic aid to Russia to enable B. Yeltsin to stay in power." And 61 percent were against that.

Despite the many predictions, at the Vancouver meeting Russia was not invited to join the "rich man's club"—the group of seven developed capitalist countries.

Nor, as far as I am aware, was a concrete decision made to offer any new incentives to U.S. private capital investments in Russia. The settlement of that problem has also been deferred. For all the Americans' desire to present the Russian president as an equal partner, they did not completely succeed. "Mr. Clinton's demonstration of support for the embattled Mr. Yeltsin and the offer of additional help remind the Russians of the superpower status that their country has lost and its new position as a poor and politically unstable state," according to AP. People here have also noted Russian Prime Minister V. Chernomyrdin's admission the other day that the Western relief offered to us is, albeit unintentionally, demeaning in character.

As B. Yeltsin announced at Sunday's press conference, he and B. Clinton discussed a total of around 50 different problems and questions. In addition to the economic aspects of Russian-U.S. mutual relations they also touched on quite a few political and disarmament problems—from the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina to the prospects for the ratification of the START I treaty by Ukraine. Almost everywhere, according to the Russian president, the positions of the participants in the dialogue were close, although Clinton did point to the existence of "natural" divergences between the two countries on a number of questions...

It is very noteworthy that when commenting on the Vancouver meeting people here frequently acknowledge that the United States, although it has an undoubted interest in the development of the situation in Russia, cannot exert substantial influence on it. Indeed, no one in the world, as U.S. Secretary of State Christopher attested recently, can help Russia until the Russians put their own house in order. "The international financial institutions, the United States, and our multilateral partners can do very little until Russia takes some steps to curb inflation," the secretary of state noted.

As if developing that idea, some observers here are now stating that undue hopes should not be pinned on the Vancouver meeting—the important thing is how events in Russia itself develop. I agree with their assessment—the response that the talks will produce in Russia may be far more important than this meeting itself.

Japan Supports Clinton's Stance on Russian Reforms

LD0304144793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1352 GMT 3 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Varlamov]

[Text] Tokyo April 3 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa told the U.S. President that he fully supports the basic directions of aid to Russian reforms which Bill Clinton outlined in his recent speech in Annapolis (Maryland).

A spokesman of the Japanese Foreign Ministry told TASS that in a 20-minute long telephone conversation on Saturday [3 April] Clinton briefed the Japanese prime minister about his stance at the coming Russian- U.S. summit and spoke in detail about the programme of help.

Miyazawa wished success to the summit. He also expressed hope that the meeting of foreign and finance ministers of G-7 scheduled in Tokyo on April 14-15 will be held in a businesslike atmosphere and promised to do everything for that.

Congressman Gephardt Previews Visit to Moscow

PM0504151593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 2

[Mikhail Pogorelyy report: "Struggle for the Hearts and Minds of the Russian People"]

[Text] An official U.S. congressional delegation headed by Richard Gephardt, leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, is arriving in Moscow next week.

In a statement in support of the process of reforms in Russia made in Congress on the eve of the visit, Gephardt said that the situation in Russia can hardly be changed quickly; it is work which will take years. It is a long-term political struggle, a struggle for the hearts and minds of the Russian people. We, he said, must support the supporters of the reforms in Russia and other republics, reinforce their hopes, and give them all the help we can.

U.S. Aid Organization Sends $2 Million in Aid

LD0604072793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0656 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ludmila Fomicheva]

[Text] St. Petersburg April 6 TASS—The U.S. non-governmental organisation, Americares, has provided humanitarian aid to St. Petersburg for the third time.

A U.S. transport plane, which landed at Pulkovo Airport, brought a humanitarian cargo worth two million dollars. The cargo contains medications and appliances for artificial respiration badly needed in St. Petersburg.

President of the Americares, Steven Johnson, told ITAR-TASS that the organisation exists for 11 years and during this period provided humanitarian aid to residents of 80 countries worth a total of 700 million dollars. This is to remind of the fact that the first rescue teams to arrive in Armenia devastated by an earthquake was a rescue team send by the Americares.

"Americans sincerely want to support Russia in this difficult period and they would do their best to help St. Petersburg," Johnson told ITAR-TASS.

U.S. Grain Aid To Break State's Trading 'Monopoly'

MK0604081093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 4

[Sergey Morozov report: "U.S. Grain Will Appear on Russian Exchanges. Aleksey Vlasov Has Ended Visit to United States"]

[Text] Aleksey Vlasov, chief manager of the Russian Commodities and Raw Materials Exchange, returned from New York yesterday with a delegation of the Russian Commission for Humanitarian and Technical Assistance. A few hours after his arrival Mr. Vlasov held a news conference, at which he made a sensational statement. According to the exchange's chief manager, an accord was reached during his visit to sell through Russian exchanges more than 800,000 tonnes of U.S. wheat, rice, and corn being supplied by the United States as humanitarian aid. Observers note the unprecedented nature of this accord, as a result of which the state structures' monopoly on the distribution of supplies will be broken.

The purpose of Aleksey Vlasov's visit was to discuss, as a member of a special delegation, the terms for distributing the humanitarian aid (520,000 tonnes of wheat, 260,000 tonnes of corn, and 40,000 tonnes of rice) which the U.S. Administration decided to supply at the end of March. The chief manager of the Russian Commodities and Raw Materials Exchange succeeded in convincing the U.S. Agriculture Department of the Russian exchanges' ability to handle such an amount of grain just as well as state structures do. The proceeds from the sale will be credited to the commission and channeled into developing social programs in Russia. The U.S. Administration is funding the purchase of grain in the United States and its transportation to the port of departure. Ships laden with grain will sail into the ports of St. Petersburg and Tallinn. It is planned to send the first ship between 5 and 15 May, and Mr. Vlasov said that the transport schedule has already been agreed with the U.S. side by a representative of the Russian Foreign Transport Administration. It has also been stipulated that the grain will be offered on exchanges not only as an actual commodity but also in the form of forward contracts to be fulfilled after six to eight weeks with a guarantee from the U.S. Administration. The prepayment in the latter case will amount to 15 percent (with the additional payment at the time the ship leaves a certain U.S. port). To begin with, closed tenders will be received from those wishing to acquire grain. In the event of the purchaser's inability to pay the additional sum required in good time, after the prepayment has been made, the contract will be put out to open exchange trading.

In addition to New York and Washington, the delegation also visited the grain exchange in Kansas City, where, according to Aleksey Vlasov, talks were held with representatives of the U.S. company which will be directly involved in grain purchases.

Cosmonaut Heads Association for Cooperation With U.S.

LD0504194393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1820 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Ivanova]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—The presentation of a Moscow Association for Cooperation with the U.S.A. was held in the Russian capital on Monday [5 April]. This public, non-governmental, non-commercial organization is a legal successor to the USSR-USA Friendship Society.

Cosmonaut Valeriy Kubasov was elected president. He took part in the famous Soviet-American joint space flight "Soyuz-Apollo".

"The association aims to develop multilateral contacts with scientific, cultural, educational, religious and charity organizations of women, veterans and young people," Kubasov told ITAR-TASS.

The executive board of the association joined together outstanding representatives of Russian intelligentsia, including Olga Lepeshinskaya, ballet dancer; Alla Masevitch, astronomist and mathematician; Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada; Valeriy Lunin, dean of the chemical faculty of the Moscow University, and many others.

The presentation was not a vain-glorious event: as early as on Tuesday, the association arranges a meeting of Russian and American female pedagogical communities. Other plans for prospective cooperation have been outlined.

U.S. Scientists Concerned Over 'Topaz' Reactors

PM0504133993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 4

[Sergey Leskov report: "Russian 'Topazes' Bought By Pentagon Threaten Other Space Programs"]

[Text] Chicago—Leading American scientists have protested Pentagon plans to launch into orbit as part of the SDI program the "Topaz" Russian nuclear reactor that was recently acquired by the United States.

The "Topaz" space reactor is the United States' first and so far only acquisition of Russian high technology. The scandalous "Topaz" odyssey in American has been described in detail by IZVESTIYA, but even after the commercial and bureaucratic problems were happily resolved, it transpired that many influential circles both in Russia and the United States were unhappy about the deal. Our people have voiced the view that we sold our unique reactor short and that $10 million for a design unique in the world was a mere trifle.

It now transpires that even in America not everyone is crazy about the "Topaz," which the Pentagon plans to launch into orbit in late 1995 or early 1996 as part of the work on SDI. Under this plan a Delta launcher should deliver the Russian reactor to an altitude of 1,590 km, where it will be started up [zapustit] and used as an autonomous engine to insert a satellite in geostationary orbit at 3,580 km. The cost of the experiment is estimated at $150 million, and it is just part of the Pentagon's long-term research in this sphere.

University of Chicago Professor Don Lamb, director of the American Astronomical Society's High Energy Departmer', stated that when it reaches its initial orbit "Topaz" will, in the year in which it is operational, fill the earth's magnetosphere with such a quantity of radioactive particles that it will be impossible to carry out many important scientific research projects in space. Prof. D. Lamb's organization along with a group of NASA advisers has protested the experiment using the Russian reactor.

As confirmation of his concern, Prof. D. Lamb recalled that in 1987-1988, when "Topaz-1" was operational in orbit, the radiation produced by the reactor distorted the results of many scientific research projects and even temporarily made certain orbits off-limits to the space shuttle. Even at that time many scientists—including in the USSR—proposed banning the use of nuclear reactors in low-earth orbits.

This time, scientists believe, "Topaz" will pose a threat to 11 scientific projects. The most expensive of them is the U.S. "Compton" orbital gamma observatory costing $617 million, which was launched in 1991. Curiously, the affected projects would include Russia's "Granat," which is now virtually the main hope of our astrophysicists.

Chicago University's Prof. D. Lamb proposes using the more powerful Atlas rocket to launch the "Topaz." The Atlas would place the reactor in a 6,000-km orbit, which would be considerably less dangerous for scientific experiments. Incidentally, some specialists have their doubts even about this decision. The Pentagon, for its part, is insisting that fears are exaggerated, that the experiment is important for science, and that it will be supported by "another segment of the scientific community."

It has to be admitted that Russia is by no means disinterested in the outcome of these talks. The fact is that the Pentagon, having already bought two "Topazes" from Russia, is currently looking at the possibility of buying another four. If the contract went ahead it would be the West's largest acquisition in the high-tech sphere from a Russia that is experiencing great economic difficulties but has still not lost its scientific potential.

Arctic 'Search and Rescue' Exercise With U.S. Previewed

PM0504141993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 2

[Colonel Aleksandr Andryushkov report: "Mid-April in the Arctic: The First Russian-American Joint Search and Rescue Exercise Is Going to Be Held"]

[Text] Disasters know no boundaries. They are truly international. People on every continent have suffered from them. There is no mission more humane than extending a timely helping hand to someone.

In mid-April there is going to be the first ever Russian-U.S. joint exercise to find, help, and evacuate passengers and crews of aircraft in distress in the Arctic far from land. The plan of the operation has been approved by Colonel General Petr Deynekin, commander in chief of the Russian Air Force.

International cooperation in helping people in distress is a long-standing tradition, Major General Gennadiy Amelkin, chief of the Federal Air and Space Search and Rescue Service, said, but there has been no in-depth collaboration so far. The only system that has been very effective is the Cospas/Sarsat system. Life demands that the bounds of cooperation be expanded. The first step in this direction has been taken by the Russian and U.S. search and rescue services...

Our country's rescue personnel, Gennadiy Vasilyevich said, have experience of work in transpolar and Arctic conditions. In 1991 they made a flight to the North Pole. Even then there were two citizens of the United States and Japan in the USSR Search and Rescue Service expedition. The Americans for their part have expertise in similar operations in Alaska. The joint exercise in the region of an island in the Arctic Ocean will help them pool their experience and make this a common asset.

The operation management headquarters, the general said, opening out a map, will be in Tiksi. From our side around 30 specialists will take part: airmen, parachutists, doctors from the Institute of Medical and Biological Problems, wireless operators, and other technical personnel. An-12 aircraft and Mi-8MT helicopters will be used. The 'Kangaroo,' a new type of parachute system, will be tried. Rescue staff and doctors fastened together will use them for the descent to the victims of the accident. A hospital will be set up in the area of the hypothetical accident. After receiving aid the victims will be evacuated to the mainland by helicopter...

The U.S. rescue personnel from the 11th Air Army in Alaska will come to Russia on board a C-130 and another transporter will bring some HA-66 [as published] helicopters. The Americans' motto "That Others May Live!" will be the symbol of the exercise.

In addition to these forces other aircraft and ships working in the Arctic will be used along with the Air Defense Forces radar and Cospas/Sarsat satellites.

This operation has been placed under the leadership of Colonel General Igor Kalugin, commander of the long-range aviation. Lieutenant General Joseph B. Ralston, commander in chief of the Alaskan command, is organizing cooperation on the U.S. side. Our newspaper will describe the course of the exercises.

Government Statement on Ukraine's Nuclear Weapons

LD0504164093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 5 Apr 93

["The Government of the Russian Federation has issued a statement with regard to nuclear weapons stationed on the territory of Ukraine"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—The government of the Russian Federation has issued a statement here. It says:

Recently the situation around nuclear weapons stationed on the territory of Ukraine has sharply deteriorated. Ukrainian representatives plainly declare that these nuclear weapons belong to Ukraine. Such statements can only be interpreted as a claim by Ukraine to the possession of nuclear weapons.

This stance adopted by the Ukrainian leadership indicates direct violation of the decision adopted by the CIS heads of state on 6 July 1992 about the participation of CIS member states in the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. According to this decision, which had also been signed by Ukraine President Leonid Kravchuk, the Russian Federation is the only state out of all the legal successors of the USSR to possess nuclear weapons. Other CIS member states have decided to join the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in the capacity of states not possessing nuclear weapons.

Kiev's claims to the possession of nuclear weapons stationed on the territory of Ukraine also violate the Lisbon protocol to the START I treaty according to which Ukraine undertook an obligation to join in the very near future the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in the capacity of a nuclear-free state. The written statement of the Ukrainian side with regard to the signing of that protocol clearly indicates that "the right and responsibility of possessing nuclear weapons of the former USSR has been given solely to the Russian Federation with the express agreement of Ukraine and all the other legal successors of the former USSR."

Kiev's policy is also at variance with Ukraine's commitments with regard to the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from its territory with the aim of dismantling and destroying them by the end of 1994. On the contrary, Ukraine is taking practical steps aimed at taking nuclear weapons on the territory of this country into its own hands. Thus, already in April 1992, the rocket and air army, together with combat units and subunits stationed in Ukraine, were included in the composition of the Ukrainian Armed Forces. Later, a new staff structure was formed in its armed forces—the center for the administrative control of troops of the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense's strategic nuclear forces. By a decision of the ministry's main headquarters, all nuclear equipment units stationed in Ukraine were placed under the center's command. The personnel of two such units in charge of over 600 nuclear munitions swore allegiance to Ukraine. The list of actions of this kind grows longer by the day. In connection with the abovementioned, the government of the Russian Federation considers it necessary to state the following:

Russia, understanding its great responsibility to the world community, is firmly advocating that the nuclear weapons that are temporarily sited on Ukraine territory should be under the jurisdiction of the Russian Federation. The position of Ukraine, which opposes this in violation of commitments taken upon itself, is fraught

with extremely dangerous consequences. The effectiveness of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons regime is under threat.

A question mark is put over whether the START I and START II treaties will come into effect; i.e., over the process of real nuclear disarmament.

The government of the Russian Federation would like to draw attention to the undisputed fact that nuclear weapons cannot belong to a nuclear-free state. Only a nuclear state can possess such weapons. It has to be emphasized that the safety of nuclear weapons is indivisible. It can only be ensured through a system of links connected in series under a single command and control. This matter is too serious and it calls for a responsible attitude. All legal and political prerequisites are already in place. It is now just a question of implementing them. Nuclear weapons cannot and must not be an object of political games.

Russia, as a nuclear state, is prepared to do its share in response to Ukraine's appeals in order to make it easier for Ukraine to meet its international commitments. As a depository of the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, Russia is prepared to provide, along with other depositories, namely the United States and the United Kingdom, guarantees of Ukraine's security, in accordance with the wishes of the Ukrainian side. These guarantees are to come into effect after Ukraine joins the treaty as a nonnuclear state.

In addition to solving the issue of ensuring the safety of nuclear arms in Ukraine and striving to fully remove all anxiety regarding these arms, the Russian side proposes to detach as quickly as possible the front sections from the missiles stationed in Ukrainian territory and to take all nuclear armaments to Russia where they will be subsequently destroyed under Ukraine's control as stipulated by the Russian-Ukrainian agreement signed in April 1992. In order to completely exclude the possible use of nuclear weapons from Ukrainian territory, in addition to political guarantees (which are quite sufficient as they are) all the weapon-delivery vehicles could be relieved of flight assignments within the next few months.

Russia is also ready to solve constructively the issue of the utilization of nuclear weapons, which is of interest to the Ukrainian side, in such a way that the nuclear substances that are retrieved could be used as fuel for Ukrainian atomic power stations. The Russian side has already put forward its proposals on this account. Now it is Kiev's turn.

Taking into account the special importance of ensuring the safety of nuclear weapons, the Russian Federation is ready to fulfill all the tasks aimed at maintaining these weapons in Ukrainian territory in a safe state given the understanding that the Ukrainian side will provide all the necessary conditions.

A responsible moment has arrived when a balanced decision should be taken immediately, a decision that is not aimed at obtaining political or other dividends. The peoples of both Ukraine and Russia and the whole international community will gain from it.

Russia is ready to solve immediately all the abovementioned problems within the framework of the Russian-Ukrainian talks currently under way.

Ukraine Diplomat on Russian Statement

OW0504125493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1225 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "Everything is topsy-turvy" in the statement of the Russian Government on the Ukrainian position concerning nuclear disarmament, Vadim Dolganov, counsellor of the Ukrainian embassy in Moscow, told INTERFAX Monday [5 April]. He made it clear that he was speaking in personal capacity because no official response has arrived from Kiev thus far.

In particular, the statement accuses Ukraine of an intention to get hold of the nuclear weapons stationed temporarily on the country's soil.

Moscow wants these weapons to remain under Russian jurisdiction and had said that as a depositary of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the Russian Federation is prepared, together with the U.S. and Britain, other depositaries, to provide Ukraine guarantees of security which would become valid as soon as it adheres to the Treaty as a nonnuclear state.

Russia also proposes dismantling the warheads from the missiles deployed in Ukraine and removing all nuclear warheads to Russia for subsequent destruction under Ukrainian supervision and declares its willingness to resolve in a constructive spirit the issue of utilizing the warheads.

This statement, the Ukrainian diplomat said, will not be overlooked by the Ukrainian Foreign Minister or top officials. He emphasized that Ukraine never intended to become a nuclear state and said so as far back as in 1990 when the Soviet Union was still in existence. Dolganov described all accusations leveled at Kiev as a political game.

Ukraine had for a long time been pressing for what is proposed in the Russian statement, Dolganov said. He expressed the hope that the Russian government will follow up on its the declared intentions.

Officials Criticize Ukrainian Attitude

OW0504165493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1618 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ukraine has taken steps indicating that Kiev wants to have nuclear arms, Russia's Deputy Defence Minister Colonel-General Boris Gromov told a news conference in Moscow on Monday [5 April]. General Gromov said such actions jeopardized nuclear nonproliferation and could prove a risky temptation for those countries that were close to going nuclear.

Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister Grigoriy Berdennikov said that Russia and the United States had presented to Kiev written security guarantees, including the non-use of force and the inviolability of borders, however, the Ukrainian authorities argued those were insufficient.

General Gromov told journalists that after the signing of the Lisbon protocols Kiev turned down Moscow's proposal for extending its jurisdiction over the nuclear arms left by the former USSR on its territory. He said the Ukrainian authorities had refused to let nuclear warheads be removed from delivery vehicles and moved to Russia for elimination under bilateral control. Kiev also rejected the proposal for cancelling flight parameters for all delivery vehicles (currently there are 176 missile launchers and 43 strategic nuclear-capable bombers in Ukraine. - IF [INTERFAX]).

General Gromov said that "Russia is ready to continue supplying the replaceable components for nuclear warheads subordinate to Russia, for instance, those deployed in Belarus and Kazakhstan". He said that putting the question in any other way would be tantamount to a direct violation of the non-proliferation regime.

Russia's chief negotiator at the talks with Ukraine Yuriy Dubinin has said that Moscow is prepared to maintain the safety of nuclear arms and consider the question of utilizing fissionable materials for nuclear power stations, as well as carry out the guarantee maintenance and manufacturer's supervision of the launchers. He said all those proposals had been submitted to Kiev, but there had been no reply yet.

General Gromov made it quite clear that for the time being Russia exercised full control over the nuclear arms in the territory of the former USSR and was capable of maintaining their safety. However, he cannot "rule out the possibility of the use of strategic nuclear arms aboard any of the 43 nuclear-capable bombers (each carrying about 670 nuclear warheads), which are based on Ukrainian territory and whose crews have taken an oath of allegiance to Ukraine.

Differences With Ukraine Over START Explained

MK0604111493 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 9

[Viktor Zamyatin report: "Russian-Ukrainian Differences Over START. Moscow Does Not Agree With Kiev's Arguments"]

[Text] In its statement yesterday the Russian Government expressed concern over Ukraine's actions testifying to its desire to acquire the status of a nuclear power. The statement was delivered after the Russian and U.S. presidents had expressed the hope in Vancouver that all the former USSR's countries would join the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Yuriy Dubinin, head of the Russian delegation to the talks with Ukraine, set out the essence of the statement at a briefing yesterday. He noted that Kiev, despite its statements about wanting nonnuclear status, is carrying out measures testifying to the reverse. In particular, in 1992 Ukraine included the 43d Missile Army and the 46th Air Army in the composition of its armed forces, and the Center for Administrative Control of Strategic Nuclear Forces Troops was recently created within the Ukrainian Defense Ministry. Russia, which the U.S. President supported in Vancouver, believes that nuclear weapons cannot have "two masters." According to Dubinin, Moscow intends to return to the discussion of this question in the near future. He also said that Russia's proposals had already been conveyed to Ukraine, and now it remains to wait for its reaction. In justifying the dragging out of nuclear disarmament, Kiev is advancing both political reasons (nuclear weapons are a factor deterring "Moscow's imperial ambitions") and financial reasons (Ukraine's experts believe that implementing the START I Treaty will cost the republic $2.8 billion, while the United States is promising it only $175 million of aid). Moscow rejects these arguments and considers the guarantee of Ukraine's security on the part of Russia and the United States to be entirely adequate. Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, head of the Russian parliamentary committee for international affairs, noted that Ukraine is obviously "testing the water as to retaining its nuclear status," which will make Russia's ratification of the START II Treaty much harder. Tomorrow KOMMERSANT-DAILY will acquaint readers with Ukraine's reaction to the Russian Government's statement.

[Article contains the following boxed text]

Currently there are 1,600 nuclear warheads in Ukraine on:
130 SS-19 (15A25) intercontinental missiles;
46 SS-24 (RS-22) intercontinental missiles;
24 Tu-95MS heavy bombers;
19 Tu-160 heavy bombers.

Russia's proposals conveyed to Ukraine:
to transfer all nuclear weapons located in Ukraine exclusively to Russian jurisdiction
to remove warheads and to transport to Russia and destroy under Ukrainian control all nuclear ammunition
to discontinue training sorties by delivery vehicles in Ukraine
to use salvageable nuclear ammunition for fuel for Ukrainian nuclear electric power stations
to create a system to supervise nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory.

Last Air Defense Units in Georgia Cease Operation

PM0604101993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 2

[Aleksandr Pelts report: "'We Are Leaving the Skies Open...': The Last Servicemen From the Russian 19th Air Defense Army Are Leaving Georgia"]

[Text] The 19th Air Defense Army, previously stationed in the Transcaucasus region, officially ceased to exist 1 April. Recently our air defense units were stationed in Georgia alone. Now there are only rear service subunits and 100 servicemen's families left in Georgia, waiting for transport for their property.

The withdrawal from Georgia was accompanied by considerable difficulties. We have already reported on the treacherous attacks on installations belonging to the 19th Army, the seizure of equipment and arms, and the open insulting of Russian officers in public places. It is hard to understand why special aggression has been shown in Tbilisi specifically against those people who actually protected Georgia's airspace. Unfortunately, not one case of the willful seizure of installations or criminal attack on Russian servicemen has received the proper assessment from the official authorities.

The final servicemen and members of their families are now gathered in a building belonging to the army rear services. It is the only installation which has not yet been seized. As Colonel Valeriy Simonov, representative of the army command, told the editorial office, those left behind face a difficult journey. They have to travel a most dangerous section of road from Tbilisi to Marneuli. That road has been the most frequent scene of attacks by gunmen and outright robbery.

The withdrawal of the Russian Air Defense Army from Georgia will finally complete the process of dismantling the once united air defense system in this region. Today the airspace over Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia is protected by national forces, but to be frank, this is being done using technical facilities forcibly taken or "privatized" from the Russian Army. For example, the air defense around Sukhumi (where the Russian Su-27 piloted by Major Vaclav Shipko was shot down) is based on five S-75 anti-aircraft missile complexes. Russia handed over some of them to Georgia two years ago. Two complexes were taken by the Georgian gunmen by force.

In Armenia and Azerbaijan the situation regarding the protection of airspace is even more catastrophic. While the sides are fighting one another foreign planes violate their borders unhindered. There is evidence, for example, that an Iranian warplane circled Baku recently undisturbed...

Grachev Goes to Sochi To Discuss Abkhazia, Troop Status

LD0604091093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0851 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—A Russian Government delegation, led by Defence Minister Army-General Pavel Grachev, has left for Sochi by air for talks with a Georgian Government delegation.

The sides plan to discuss the settlement of the situation in Abkhazia, the status of Russian troops in Georgia, and also a number of economic and political problems.

Chernomyrdin Meets Belarusian Counterpart Kebich

OW0504213493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1919 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Prime Minister of Belarus Vyacheslav Kebich, who arrived in Moscow on a brief visit on Monday [5 April], has met with his Russian counterpart Viktor Chernomyrdin.

Neither the press center of the Russian government, nor the permanent mission of Belarus in Moscow has revealed any details of the visit.

In the meantime, sources at the office of the Belarusian prime minister in Minsk have said that Kebich went to Moscow to discuss the supplies of Russian oil as well as other fuels and lubricants for Belarusian agriculture.

'Gratifying' Outcome to Strategic Forces Talks With Belarus

PM0604111393 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 3

[Report by Valeriy Kovalev: "Treaty Almost Ready"]

[Text] Minsk—The latest, the fourth, meeting of Russian and Belarusian expert commissions on strategic forces ended in Minsk on 2 April.

Military experts, diplomats, and lawyers from the two countries put two days of intensive effort into the preparation of a draft agreement on the withdrawal of strategic forces temporarily stationed on the territory of Belarus and a draft treaty on the status of strategic forces' military formations in the Republic of Belarus.

As Colonel General Gennadiy Gichkin, head of the Russian military delegation, told your KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent, the sides have all but completed the work on both documents, and the draft treaty and draft agreement will be able to be initialed and presented to the Russian and Belarusian government

heads by the end of April. This view was shared by Major General Nikolay Churkin, who headed the Belarusian military delegation.

The outcome is all the more gratifying in view of the fact that the issues that were being examined at the talks were by no means simple. During the talks the experts agreed on the procedure for the withdrawal of strategic forces and handover and receipt of the military camps that are being vacated, the principles of the division of military property and material and technical facilities, and security measures for the transportation of nuclear weapons. All these matters were reflected in the draft agreement. The withdrawal schedule was discussed in outline, but the sides decided that the seven-year period allocated for it in accordance with the international accords can be somewhat reduced.

Work on the draft treaty on the status of strategic forces' military formations temporarily stationed in Belarus took place in a spirit of mutual understanding. Only one problem was not finally resolved: A large number of Belarus-born commissioned and warrant officers is serving in the Russian strategic forces and many of them have expressed a desire to stay in their homeland after their units have been withdrawn to the Russian Federation, but by no means all of them have housing. The question of financing the construction of housing for them arose in this connection. The Belarusian side declared its readiness to take responsibility for the housing contruction and build it not only for its own boys, but also for Russian servicemen who have no accommodations, but on condition that Russia agrees to finance the construction.

Tough Stance on Baltics Reflects Domestic Policy Pressure

MK0304083693 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 9

[Anastasiya Romashkevich report: "Hard-Line Stance on Baltic States Designed To Assuage Opposition in Russia"]

[Text] On 1 April the Russian Foreign Ministry received a note of protest sent by the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry in response to Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev's statement about slowing the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic states. Lithuania demands that Russia comply with the agreements calling for the withdrawal to be completed by 31 August 1993 and also that it give explanations as Moscow's stance. Apparently, Latvia and Estonia are preparing to take similar steps. Although Grachev explains that this decision has been prompted by the refusal on the part of Estonia and Latvia to give social guarantees to the personnel of the troops to be pulled out, it also appears to be influenced by the aggravation of the internal political situation in Russia.

The directive to slow down the troop withdrawal was signed by President Yeltsin back on 29 October 1992. At that time the lack of housing for officers was cited as the reason for the move. In addition, Russia had significant complaints to make against the Baltic states regarding respect for human rights. A series of talks ensued, which enabled the sides to draw closer together. Nonetheless, Russia has reverted to its October stance, but Grachev's statement refers only to Latvia and Estonia, whereas with Lithuania the problems of guarantees and human rights have effectively been resolved. Apparently, the reason for the statement made by Grachev at a meeting of NATO defense ministers does not come down just to the disagreements between Russia and the Baltics but also comprises a number of other no less important factors. First, Russia has been trying to avert the creation of a strong anti- Russian Baltic bloc. The fact that the first protesting voice was heard precisely from Vilnius, however, shows that Russia's desired aim is a long way off. Second, the statement should be viewed in the context of the power crisis in Russia. Insisting that the troop withdrawal should be slowed down, Yeltsin makes a curtsy toward the disgruntled section of the officers and the opposition who demand that Russia toughen its stance on the Baltics. On the whole, however, the recent fresh tensions in Russian-Baltic relations (along with the Balkan policy) attest that Russian diplomacy is growing more and more dependent on domestic politics.

Paris Club Defers Debt Repayments for 10 Years

LD0204173093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1704 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Krasnoschekov]

[Text] Paris April 2 TASS—The Paris Club of creditors adopted an unprecedented decision on Friday [2 April] to defer 1993 payments of the 15 billion [currency not specified] Russian debt for ten years, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin told TASS after negotiations with the club.

The total former Soviet external debt to be paid in 1993 amounts to 17 billions.

"The conditions which we agreed upon with the Paris Club give us a break". Without such conditions it would be impossiblke to speak about any favourable financial and economic grounds for Russian reforms, Shokhin said.

Now we have suitable terms for debt servicing which were foreseen in the 1993 budget recently adopted by parliament, he added.

IMF Decision on 'Quicker Financial Aid'

LD0304083093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0807 GMT 3 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolyov]

[Text] Washington April 3 TASS—The International Monetary Fund (IMF) announced on Friday [2 April]

that it was considering possibilities of rendering quicker financial aid to Russia and other states which are establishing a free market economy.

According to the IMF proposal, Russia will be able to receive financial support of this largest international financial organization even if it does not fulfil economic conditions put forward by the fund.

This new measure will enable the IMF to render aid at an early stage to its member countries which are facing more destructive systems' shocks, says a statement issued by the fund here.

This step is aimed at giving support to decisive and effective stabilization and efforts to carry out reforms at their early stage, and is also called upon to assist their decisive support on the part of the IMF on usual conditions, the document noted.

The statement does not reveal what credit can be given to Russia under new conditions, however, according to some sources, it will amount to at least 1.5 billion dollars or roughly 25 per cent of the Russian quota in the IMF.

Shumeyko: Italy Ready To Support Moscow at G-7 Talks

OW0504113693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1102 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Italy is prepared to support Russia at negotiations by finance and foreign ministers of G-7 countries, RF [Russian Federation] first vice-premier Vladimir Shumeyko has said in an interview with Interfax upon his return from Rome on Sunday [4 April].

He recalled that Russia had requested deferring the debt in terms of sum rather than in terms of time. For instance, this year Russia is to repay $3.5 Bn [billion] in interest on foreign debts. We offer to pay off $2.5 Bn and leave $1 Bn for Russia to support small and medium businesses and stimulate export-oriented enterprises. We reached full accord on this issue when we discussed it with Italy's foreign and finance ministers in Rome, Mr. Shumeyko stressed.

He said that the Italian leaders were keenly interested in closer financial and economic cooperation between the two countries. However, he emphasized that the scale of this cooperation would largely depend on the outcome of the G-7 meeting on 14-16 April.

Croatian Envoy Lauds Russian Participation in Peace Plan

MK0304115293 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 11

[Sergey Tsekhmistrenko, Andrey Yedemskiy report under the rubric "Ambassadors' Week": "Visas to Finland To Be Paid for in Hard Currency"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] One of the guests invited to a reception at the Italian Embassy was Croatian Ambassador to Russia Niko Bezmalinovic. [passage omitted]

The ambassador told your KOMMERSANT-DAILY correspondent about problems of the Yugoslav settlement. He thinks that the Croatian Government is interested in a speedy end to hostilities in Bosnia, because it would "give a chance to move on to a settlement of the situation in Croatia itself." Russia's and the U.S. joining in the implementation of the Vance-Owen plan is highly important. Russia, Mr. Bezmalinovic thinks, "has plenty of potential for influencing the Serbian side," and that will help reach a settlement.

Speaking of Yugoslavia's disintegration process, the ambassador observed that responsibility for that rests mainly on Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. As for Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, he proposed the creation of a confederation, an idea with which Slovenia, Bosnia, and Macedonia agreed. Belgrade opposed it, however, and when the Croatian people came out by democratic means in favor of the creation of a separate state and seceding from Yugoslavia, "there followed aggression in Croatia by Serbia, and then also in Bosnia."

According to the ambassador, people in Russia, like in the rest of the world, know about events in the Balkans too one-sidedly, "as refracted through Belgrade's prism." This is natural "because the diplomatic corps in the former Yugoslavia consisted mainly of Serbs, and today the 'Serbian lobby' continues to delude the world community." Nevertheless, Mr. Bezmalinovic is convinced that this will not hinder expansion of Russo-Croatian relations in the future. In fact, there is quite a good base for this; last year Croatia's share in Russia's overall trade with the Yugoslav republics was 25 percent. The Croats hope that "frost-hardy Russians" will see to it that Adriatic beaches are filled during the "dead season"—in early spring and late fall.

Foreign Ministry Welcomes Macedonian Stand on UN Membership

LD0204143493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1237 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—The Russian Foreign Ministry said it met with interest the recent address of Kiro Gligorov, president of the Republic of Macedonia, to the people and qualified it as "a very important statement".

"We welcome the readiness of Macedonian leadership, expressed in the statement, to adopt the proposals worked out by the UN Security Council to untie the problems of adopting Macedonia as a UN member", the ministry said in a statement on Friday [2 April].

It added that Gligorov again showed realism and constructiveness which are so necessary during the complicated period in the history of the new state which was recognised by Russia.

The statement of the president "clearly shows the desire to look for mutually acceptable ways of solving the problem and reaching accord with neighbouring states", the Russian ministry said, expressing hope that the desire would meet an adequate reaction of the world community and the interested sides will make response steps which will improve relations among Balkan states.

Shakhray Meets German State Secretary in Bonn

LD0504213393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2046 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy]

[Text] Bonn April 6 TASS—Sergey Shakhray, Russian deputy prime minister and chairman of the State Commiteee for the Nationality Policy, who is attending a session of the Russian-German commission for problems of ethnic Germans residing in Russia here, met the state secretary of the German Foreign Ministry Dieter Kastrup in Bonn today.

The two discussed the situation in Russia in the wake of the extraordinary Ninth Congress of People's Deputies held in Moscow recently. Kastrup said he understood the complex nature of current processes in Russia and expressed the conviction that democratic transformations and reforms will go ahead successfully despite the emergent problems.

The meeting between the Russian and U.S. Presidents Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton held in Vancouver was successful and nudged Western countries to articulate afresh their position towards current processes in Russia, Shakhray and Kastrup noted.

During the meeting, the two exchanged information about the third session of the Russian-German governmental commission on problems of ethnic Germans in Russia. They achieved mutual understanding that the process of rehabilitating Russian Germans and solving their problems enters a new stage of specific deeds.

Further on Statement on DPRK Treaty Withdrawal

LD0204160593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1237 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Statement by Governments of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States on the DPRK's intention to withdraw from the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty, issued at the Russian Federation Foreign Ministry on 2 April]

[Text] The Governments of the Russian Federation, Great Britain, and the United States, which are depositories of the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation Treaty, are making the following statement:

We express regret and concern in connection with the declaration by the DPRK of its intention to withdraw from the Nuclear Weapons Non-proliferation Treaty.

Since the treaty is a substantial element of world peace and security, the DPRK's withdrawal from it will represent a serious threat to regional and international stability.

We express doubt over the fact that the reasons cited by the DPRK for withdrawing from the treaty are exceptional circumstances connected with the content of the treaty. In this connection, we note that, as a non-nuclear treaty member state, the DPRK is guaranteed nuclear security.

It would be in the interests of the DPRK to preserve its treaty membership and to comply fully with its provisions. This would promote greater confidence on the part of the international community in the nature of the DPRK's nuclear program and in the DPRK's desire for positive international relations, including peaceful cooperation in the nuclear field.

Moreover, the withdrawal of the DPRK from the treaty would threaten the stability on the Korean peninsula, which has increased in recent years, and would undermine the efforts to implement the joint declaration by the North and the South on making the Korean Peninsula nuclearfree.

We are urging the DPRK to retract its statement and to fulfill its obligations toward the treaty, as well as its obligations on the guarantees which remain in force. In connection with this we firmly support the efforts of the international agency on nuclear energy aimed at implementing its agreement on guarantees with the DPRK.

The depositories appeal to all member countries of the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to join the present statement and to appeal the DPRK to review its stance and fully respect its obligations toward the treaty.

Controls Stepped Up To Halt Scientists Leaving for DPRK

PM0604092593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By M. Maksimovskaya; from the "Novosti" nescast]

[Text] [Maksimovskaya] Strict passport controls have been introduced at Khabarovsk Airport. Passengers flying to Pyongyang are checked thoroughly. The Russian Ministry of Security explains the measure by the need to keep back scientists in possession of top secret information who have recently been heading for North

Korea to earn money. Quite recently 36 nuclear scientists bound for Korea on an official contract were arrested at the airport. All 36 of the arrested specialists had been working at the same top secret enterprise. Russia's secret services are now investigating how the North Korean employers got hold of them and how it was that so many scientists managed to obtain exit visas at the Foreign Ministry simultaneously without any problems. The scientists themselves prefer to remain silent, but as German journalists ascertained from Russian secret service staffers, it is not impossible that some authoritative figures in the Russian leadership may have acted as intermediaries in this matter.

At the same time, many observers point out that, even if they wanted to, the authorities would be unable to stop scientists wishing to leave the country. According to Western information, many specialists from the former USSR are working on nuclear projects in various countries for far higher wages than at home. Meanwhile, there are increasing instances of unemployed scientists offering services in their fields through advertisements in Russian newspapers. In one such advertisement a nuclear physicist and his wife claimed, among their past achievements, to have played a role in developing the neutron bomb. Few would be surprised if this family of scientists turned up, say, in North Korea.

Khasbulatov Receives PRC Ambassador; Reforms To Continue

LD0604112993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1055 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation parliament, received Wang Jinqing, ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the Russian Federation, in the House of the Soviets today at the latter's request. "No matter what sort of new parliament emerges if pre-term elections of the legislative authority are held," Ruslan Khasbulatov said in reply to a question from the ambassador, "the policy of reforms will, it goes without saying, be continued." During the meeting, issues of Russian Federation-PRC interstate relations, including interparliamentary relations, were discussed. Ruslan Khasbulatov said that in spite of all the changes in Russia's domestic and foreign policy, China remains not only a partner state, but also a friendly state. Russia is building its relations with its closest neighbor upon the basis of good-neighborliness, which is the basis for stability of international relations. The interlocutors examined a number of specific economic projects; here the importance of developing economic ties on a regional and local basis was pointed out—a press release by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet press center states.

Work on Border Demarcation With China Begins

PM0504132193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 1

[Aleksandr Suvorov report under the "From Our News Bureau" rubric: "Border Troops Clarify Positions Regarding Service and the Border"]

[Text] Russian Federation Border Troops Press Bureau—Work demarcating the Russian-Chinese border has started for the first time. Points of demarcation along 4,300 kms are to be designated in Khabarovsk Kray over five years.

Meanwhile in Moscow assemblies of officers of border districts, combined units, and units have been held under the leadership of Colonel General Vladimir Shlyakhtin, commander of the Russian Border Troops. Problems in border troops' activity relating to the maintenance of law and order and the strengthening of discipline were discussed.

Chief of Chinese Naval Forces Arrives

MK0604080493 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 2

[Report from Olga Reviznikova roundup: "Who, Where?"]

[Text] Vice Admiral Zhang Lianzhong, commander of the Chinese People's Liberation Army's Naval Forces, has arrived in Moscow at the invitation of Adm. Feliks Gromov, commander in chief of Russia's Navy. During his 10-day visit the Chinese military chief plans also to visit St. Petersburg, Severomorsk, and Vladivostok. He will hold talks with Russian Deputy Defense Minister Andrey Kokoshin and with the commanders of the Northern and Pacific Fleets and Leningrad Naval Base. Mr. Zhang Lianzhong will visit the Naval Academy of the Russian Navy and go on board a diesel engine nuclear submarine, the nuclear guided-missile cruiser Admiral Ushakov, and other surface ships. On the eve of his departure for Moscow, Mr. Zhang Lianzhong said that his visit "must promote the development of ties between the two countries' naval forces." Questions of China's buying of warships from Russia will also be examined during the visit.

Foreign Ministry Official's Visit to East Africa Reviewed

LD0204144993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1355 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Postanogov and Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—Head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's African Department Georgiy Karasin has visited Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda from March 18 through 31 to intensify the Russian African policy, head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's Press and Information Department Sergey Yastrzhembskiy told a briefing here today.

Karasin's meeting with leaders of these states confirmed the mutual interest in development of partner relations and deepening of bilateral cooperation, including trade and economic contacts on a new mutually beneficial

basis. The African leaders voiced their support for Russian democratic changes and called for Russian active and diverse participation in African affairs.

Political consultations noted coincidence or similarity of the sides' stands on major international and regional issues, and touched upon settlement of african conflict situations.

Russia will further pursue a policy course towards the development of comprehensive cooperation with the African states on the basis of good traditions of interaction in various spheres and with due account of realities.

Plane With Russian Crew Fired Upon in Angola

LD0604075393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0521 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Buyanov]

[Text] Luanda April 6 TASS—An AN-32 plane of the World Food Programme with a Russian crew was fired upon on Monday [5 April] at the airport of the Angolan city of Uige which has been under UNITA control since November last year.

After the plane landed at Uige airport and was taxiing to the parking lot, an UNITA soldier opened fire on it from a machine-gun from a distance of not more than 150 metres, crew commander Sergey Altukhov told ITAR-TASS.

Another 20 soldiers were silently watching the scene. The plane crew managed to turn the plane around and render it airborne. Luckily, the bullets did not hit the plane's cockpit.

When the AN-32 landed at Luanda airport, technicians found 96 holes in the fuselage. Most systems of the plane were rendered inoperative. Flight engineer Aleksandr Tsoglin sustained a perforating wound in the leg and was rushed to hospital. The other members of the crew were unhurt.

The U.N. Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM) recently undertook to organise the delivery of humanitarian aid to the war-stricken civilian population.

Before departure for Uige, the AN-32 crew received UNAVEM spokesmen's assurances of the safety of a flight to the administrative centre of Uige province.

Algerian State Council Chairman Receives Yeltsin Envoy

LD0604083793 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The chairman of the Algerian Supreme State Council, Ali Kafi, received yesterday the Russian president's special representative, Boris Kolokolov, who had arrived in Algeria on a working visit. During the meeting it was pointed out that Russia and Algeria had all possibilities for stepping up political contacts and expanding mutually profitable cooperation in economic, cultural, and other spheres. The sides noted the proximity of views on important international problems.

Qatar's Foreign Minister Arrives in Moscow

LD0504190793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1759 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Qatar's Foreign Minister Hamad al Thani arrived in Moscow on a visit today. This is the Qatari minister's first visit to Russia in the history of bilateral relations.

A spokesman in the Russian Foreign Ministry told ITAR-TASS that Hamad al Thani will hold talks in the Russian foreign policy establishment and meet several Russian leaders. A key issue at the forthcoming talks is expected to be the discussion of prospects and specific areas of the development of trade and economic relations between the two states.

Talks will also focus on efforts to enhance stability and security in the Gulf area and the state of matters in the Mideast peace settlement process.

Political Issues

'Fourth' Roundtable Session Opens in Moscow 6 Apr

Calls For 'Economic Solidarity Pact'

LD0604102593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0847 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—The fourth session of the "Roundtable", which was set up by a resolution of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Russian Federation Government, opened in Moscow today to seek constructive measures to bring the economy out of crisis. Opening the session, Yuriy Voronin, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, announced that representatives of the Russian Communist Party, the Russian Republican Party, and youth and women's organizations have joined the representatives of parties and movements, academics, and politicians taking part in the Roundtable. Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, Vice Premier Georgiy Khizha, CIS Commander in Chief Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, and Russian Federation people's deputies, academics, and entrepreneurs are attending the roundtable today. Rapporteur Yevgeniy Saburov called on those assembled to draw up an "Economic Solidarity" pact, which would be based upon all political forces in society reaching accord "on spreading the weight of the crisis uniformly among various social groups," on giving support to the private sector of the economy, and cutting inflation, the budget deficit, and the unemployment level.

Rutskoy Predicts 'Civil War'

LD0604103393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0948 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—Speaking at today's session of the "roundtable" set up in accordance with a resolution of the Supreme Soviet presidium and the Russian Government, Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy sharply criticized the present composition of the Council of Ministers. Describing state management of the current economic process as extremely unsatisfactory, Aleksandr Rutskoy said that the reigning chaos might lead "either to civil war or dictatorship." Moreover, in his view, the process will exacerbate still further for as long as "these figures remain in government and go on rejecting programs to rectify the economy on the basis of national accord, which have been put forward by the Civil Union, the Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Russia, and participants of previous sessions of the 'roundtable.'"

Reproaching the government for believing itself to enshrine the most incontrovertible truth, Aleksandr Rutskoy made the following forecast: "If the situation is not changed in the next two to three months, we will get something between a civil war and a dictatorship." In the vice president's view, "There are already signs of this: calls have already been made to write a constitution to suit the monarch and to turn to resolute actions." "Society does not like the position it has found itself in," the vice president concluded.

Further on Roundtable

LD0604140493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1333 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—Participants in the debate held on Tuesday [6 April] at a round table meeting called to work out anti-crisis measures have urged all political forces of society for economic solidarity. In accordance with recommendations worked out by specialists of the Russian Academy of Sciences, they deem it necessary to sort out economic priorities and to keep from squandering the limited financial resources of the state on a large number of programmes.

Among priorities, Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy mentioned housing construction and food production which are decisive for social stability. People's Deputy Nikolay Travkin, leader of the Russian Democratic Party, said that support for new organisational structures in the agrarian sector is the main task.

Academician Leonid Abalkin who delivered a report said it is necessary to readjust Russian economy to the support of business.

Josif Diskin, economist at the Civic Union, suggested that an area of accord be formed by the government, parliament, political parties and movements. He believes that the parametres of this accord should be specific positions to be upheld by practical actions of all state and public structures: to keep the industrial recession within 12 per cent, inflation rate within 20-25 per cent. The unemployment rate should not surpass five per cent.

People with contrasting views—representatives of the Russian Democratic Party and Communists, members of the National Salvation Front and of the Russian Republican Party, of other public organisations—agreed on the main thing, that there is no alternative to national accord.

Yeltsin's Approval Rating 'Unexpectedly' Drops

OW0304134193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1311 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Moscow the rating of the Russian President Boris Yeltsin, which rapidly raised on the eve of the 9th Congress of the Russian People's Deputies from 36% (March 11) to 53% (March 25), has unexpectedly fallen to 49% by early April.

These are the results of the most recent opinion poll conducted by the Independent Institute for sociology of

parliamentarism headed by Nugar Betaneli [name as received] on April 1. Over 1,000 respondents, representing people of different age, sex, education, and social position have been questioned during the research.

The rating of Boris Yeltsin's political rival, head of the Russian parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov, has increased, the data of the opinion poll say. The number of those who assess activity of speaker of Russian parliament "positively" or "with a positive interest" has grown from 6% (March 25) to 10% by April 1.

According to the experts of Betaneli's Institute, the changes testify to a certain dissatisfaction and lack of correspondence "of Yeltsin's psychological image during the 9th Congress" to mass social expectations. The experts believe that this fact explains a sharp "drop" of the factor of public confidence in the Russian President, namely the number of the Moscow electors "confident" in the President has reduced from 60% on March 25 to 46% on April 1 and the number of those who are non-confident in the President has increased from 10% (March 25) to 16% (April 1).

The Muscovites' answers concerning the issues to be presented at the April 25 referendum, the Institute's experts say, also testify to "noticeable fluctuations in social moods and symptoms of possible reduction of number of electors with pro-presidential orientation." In particular, 22% of Muscovites are in favor of premature presidential elections and 45% are against. 56% of the Muscovites advocate premature elections of the people's deputies and 9% do not support this idea.

Results of a computer modelling of this situation conducted by the Institute's experts demonstrate that for the time being Yeltsin still preserves "chances for a success" during a referendum, however, "more energetic and precise efforts" are needed for this than the analysts of Yeltsin's team believe.

Poll Highlights Opinion on Yeltsin-Khasbulatov Clash

MK0304081293 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 2

[Oleg Savelyev report under the rubric "Social Barometer": "People of Russia on Power Conflict"]

[Text] Between 27 and 29 March the All-Russia Center for Public Opinion Research conducted a representative express-poll among 1,617 people in various cities of the Russian Federation.

The answers to some of the questions of this survey are expressed in percentages.

What do you think: Is the current conflict in the Russian leadership a conflict between Yeltsin and Khasbulatov, or is it between the executive and legislative authorities, or is it between democratic forces and the former party and state structures?

Between Yeltsin and Khasbulatov	23
Between legislative and executive powers	22
Between democrats and party and state structures	34
Do not know, hard to say	21

Are you in favor of electing a new parliament, or resignation of the president, or reaching a compromise between the president and parliament?(For comparison, there are answers to the same question obtained in the course of a poll among Muscovites.)

	Moscow		Russia
	22 Mar	26 Mar	27-29 Mar
Electing a new parliament	48	46	31
Resignation of the president	11	10	15
Compromise between them	31	25	34
Hard to say	10	19	20

With what do you think the current conflict will most probably end?

Yeltsin's victory	23
Khasbulatov's victory	2
A compromise between them	18
Resignation of both	15
Civil war	7
This conflict has no end	14
Hard to say	21

Rutskoy Says Yeltsin Should Dismiss Shumeyko, Others

OW0204133193 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Report on "exclusive interview" with Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy by NHK correspondent Kazuo Kobayashi in Moscow; date not given—Rutskoy speaks in Russian with Japanese subtitles; the following is translated from the Japanese]

[Excerpt] Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy has granted his first exclusive interview to NHK following the meeting of the Congress of People's Deputies. In the interview, Rutskoy said that a drastic cabinet reshuffle appears necessary to win support from middle-of-the-road voters if President Boris Yeltsin is to garner an endorsement for his policies in the planned national referendum. Great attention is now focused on whether Vice President Rutskoy will stay in office while President Yeltsin is being backed into a corner.

[Begin Rutskoy recording] I remain loyal to President Yeltsin because I like him as he is. But regarding the president's aides, it is a different story. I will fight against the people who are responsible for the current political crisis in Russia. [end recording]

As a condition for compromise, Rutskoy said President Yeltsin should form a government that consists of people who are familiar with actual production in order to win support from middle-of-the-road voters. He said that Deputy Prime Ministers Vladimir Shumeyko, Aleksander Shokin, and Anatoliy Chubays—advocates of radical economic reform—should be dismissed to enable the president to win the upcoming referendum. [passage omitted]

'Power' Ministers' Presence at Yeltsin Rally Deplored

PM0504153593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Vyacheslav Kocherov "Rejoinder": "For Whom Is the Law Written?"]

[Text] The television news, which gave extensive coverage to President B. Yeltsin's speech at the St. Basil's rally, also showed many well-known figures whose faces have been seen at this kind of event. But the published photographs devoted to the event also showed two power ministers—Generals V. Barannikov and V. Yerin—standing behind the president.

What are we to read into this? In his recent address to the people the president clearly emphasized the impermissibility of using the military for political purposes. He particularly noted that, in his capacity as supreme commander in chief, he had issued an order to the Defense Ministry regarding this matter. His position was supported in their speeches to deputies by all the power ministers without exception. Moreover, the Russian Federation Government statement directly pointed out that the "power structure leaders belonging to the government—the ministers of defense, security, and internal affairs—remain true to constitutional principles and will ensure order without involving the Armed Forces, security forces, or the forces of law and order in political confrontation."

The officers and generals who have recently spoken out in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA wholly and fully share the concern of the Russian Federation leadership and its citizens about the impermissibility of servicemen getting involved in political battles. But two of the power ministers (the third currently being absent from Russia) could not refrain from participating in the rally.

Incidentally, "could not refrain" is probably the wrong way of putting it. The generals were hardly likely to have attended the rally out of their own free will. In all probability, they were persuaded to attend by the Russian president standing alongside them who had decided to engage in his traditional appeal to his constant support group. He thereby involuntarily—or, rather, deliberately—"included" as part of that group of people whose appearance in the midst of such an electric crowd was strictly forbidden. Forbidden, strangely enough, by the president himself...

Stankevich, Sokolov Comment on Political Situation

LD0504194193

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1435 GMT on 5 April carries the 30-minute "News, Economy, Policy" program presented by Igor Pototskiy.

Pototskiy introduces the program by summing up the events of the recent Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Congresses of People's Deputies. He says it is not clear whether the Congresses have actually brought any results. He asks if the conflict in power has ended. In connection with these questions, he interviews Veniamin Sokolov, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Republic, and Sergey Stankevich, Russian presidential adviser on political issues.

The program consists of clips of interviews with Sokolov and Stankevich, with additional commentary by Pototskiy. Sokolov says it is necessary to decide along which path Russia should develop. It is a fact that parliament proposes one way, the executive another.

Stankevich agrees with this. He says: "First, there is the assumption, which each side makes in relation to each other, that '"I am democracy, I am reform,' and on the contrary there is the suspicion about the other side that there is reaction, plotting, aspiration to dictatorship, aspiration to revenge and so on." He says it is necessary to move on in political life, but there is a lack of a unifying vision of what kind of Russia we want to live in.

He further explains: There have been two major "waves" which have improved matters in Russia. The first "wave" came in 1985 with the coming to power of Gorbachev, the second in 1989 when elections removed the CPSU as the ruling party. This "wave" peaked in 1991, probably too early as people were unprepared for the speed with which democracy was being thrust upon them. There is now lack of direction and, he argues: "It is from this that the increased level of conflict arises. It is from this that things take on significance which, in fact, from the point of view of a long-term strategy, from the point of view of moving towards a new Russia, are not of great significance."

In a brief commentary following this interview, Pototskiy remarks that it is interesting that the two men, one of whom represents the legislature, the other the executive—which are in confrontation with each other—have the same broad views. However, Sokolov still blames the government for many of the country's present problems. In a further extract from the interview,

Sokolov says: "We do not have the economic resources for the conflict to continue. If the present policy in the economic sphere continues, then I think by autumn there will be a complete crash and collapse here—in both the financial and economic system. We do not have the reserves of time."

Sokolov continues: "I am profoundly convinced that the course which the government is continuing to carry out, with the prime minister and the president; this is a path which will lead to the complete destruction and obliteration of Russia as an independent state." "The same Gaydar policies are continuing, there have been no changes, no changes have been introduced into the policy." However, he further argues, the deputies must take some of the blame because they voted the ministers into office. It is also true that not enough time was given to consideration of candidate ministers.

In a further extract from the interview with Stankevich, he says of parliament: "It is true that parliament and its leading figures say that they are not against the reforms, but that they would like to implement these reforms in a different way. Sometimes, they argue, it is a matter of speed—quickly or slowly." Stankevich believes that that they must be carried out as quickly as possible, if society can bear the immediate difficult consequences.

Asked why there is such a lack of understanding between parliament and the government, Stankevich replies that it is more a matter of personalities. Sokolov says further that it would be ideal if the government and deputies could work together. Stankevich thinks there is ground for compromise. However, The president must not be a figurehead, he must control the government and prime minister. He was democratically elected and "he is an active president who is obliged to generate the strategy for national development," Stankevich states. It would not be in Russia's interest for him to be separated from the government.

Back in the studio, Pototskiy then turns to the coming referendum. A clip is shown consisiting of a brief series of interviews with people on the street expressing their views on the referendum. The majority seem to back Yeltsin. Asked his view on the referendum, Sokolov says: "According to estimates about 35-45 percent of people will vote in the referendum. If that is the case then the referendum will simply not take place. How should this fact be assessed? We would assess this is as a complete collapse."

Sokolov says the Constitution requires Yeltsin to achieve a majority of votes, and that 50 percent of the population must vote for the decision to be valid. However, if Yeltsin does get the votes of more than 25 percent of the population would this signify the support of the whole country, he asks. It would be better if there was 90 percent vote in favor, or only a 10 percent vote in favor—at least the result would be clear.

Stankevich says he believes the referendum will give Yeltsin a vote of confidence: "I think that the answer to the first question—the main question in the referendum, the reason all this has happened, the question of support for the president—will be positive. The forecast for the second question is not so good. As regards the other questions, I hope that we will have early elections."

If the referendum does give a definite result then it will have to be accepted by the authorities, Sokolov states in a further extract from his interview. Stankevich agrees with Sokolov, as the referendum is being held in accordance with the Constitution: "There is no sense in arguing with its results. I think that both sides are simply obliged to accept the results and behave accordingly." However, even if both sides accept the results, "the referendum is not an end to conflict. It determines the positions of forces, the real positions of forces." He continues: "The referendum, by revealing the positions of forces, may in fact worsen the struggle. Early elections are the decisive stage."

At this point Pototskiy comments: "To all appearances it is more or less clear to both sides that the most probable result of the referendum will be confidence in the president and lack of confidence in economic policy. If anything is capable of saving the situation after such a result, then it is the assumed yes in answer to the question on early elections."

On this point Sokolov says: "If they vote in favor of holding early elections to the body of deputies, then on the whole none of us is against this." Pototskiy comments that this seems to be the only point that both men agree on, it is only strange that they could not have reached it with less complications. Pototskiy then quotes interviews in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA on 1 April with Tatarstan President Shaymiyev and Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet Chairman Rakhimov, who say that they will make more of their own decisions without reference to the center.

Stankevich says it is evident that the voice of the regions has become stronger recently as the authorities in Moscow grow weaker. However, he explains, this has a positive side: "The regions and the republics of Russia may become a decisive stabilizer which will halt the further development of the conflict and limit it." He continues: "The temptation to create some kind of Kuwait—I say this purely metaphorically—prospering principalities around some kind of natural resources in the center of Russia, like an island in the ocean of the general Russian crisis, isolating themselves from everything that is going on to enjoy a quiet life—it is possible that such an illusory picture excites some people's minds. But this is pure illusion, it is a mirage which will quickly break up."

Sokolov too speaks about the danger of regions breaking off, saying that they would leave themselves defenseless: "U.S. military doctrine at the moment is being closely re-examined. Because the military threat from the former USSR or Russia really has disappeared, it simply does not exist, and this possibility is simply not taken

into account. But they say clearly that the experience of Kuwait and Iraq will form the basis of their doctrine. That is any unruly state of such a scale—they will simply bring it to its senses in this way with the blessing of the United Nations. Let's look at it. Russia collapses into 10, 15 such states. Naturally there will no longer be an army, there will be no forces to defend their own interests." He adds: "This is the reality of today. This is the U.S. military doctrine."

Stankevich, in a final extract from the interview with him, says that one of the problems in the present situation is that neither side trusts the other and views any of its initiatives with suspicion. Statements are often insulting and to make a point stand out it is now necessary to be even more insulting otherwise it will disappear in the general background of insults. Pototskiy concludes the program with the rhetorical question: Is the conflict between the authorities ever going to end?

Appointment, Yeltsin Report Signals Corruption Battle

MK0204130693 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 10

[Mikhail Lashch report: "Conference on Fight Against Corruption. President's Report on Fight Against Corruption Being Prepared"]

[Text] An extended session of the Russian Security Council's Interdepartmental Commission for Fighting Crime and Corruption ended late on 31 March in the Kremlin (as KOMMERSANT-DAILY reported in its 1 April issue). The commission's session took place as usual behind closed doors, but according to KOMMERSANT-DAILY information, it discussed in particular certain provisions of the Russian president's draft report on priority measures to fight corruption and organized crime, which Boris Yeltsin will possibly deliver in the Supreme Soviet.

KOMMERSANT-DAILY has learned from informed sources that at the interdepartmental commission's session, chaired by Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, a whole package of proposals on organizing the fight against corruption and crime prepared by the interdepartmental commission's experts was submitted to participants for familiarization and discussion. After the commission's members have studied them, the proposals together with specific draft decrees and directives will be referred to the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, and the president for finalization and adoption. Furthermore, it is proposed to submit these proposals to one of the next Security Council sessions and to formalize them subsequently as council decisions. The proposals' contents are restricted. According to information from the interdepartmental commission's apparatus, most of them will be included in the Russian president's report, which is being drafted by the commission's specialists and which Boris Yeltsin intends to deliver to Russian parliamentarians in the second half of April.

According to KOMMERSANT-DAILY information Leonid Zayka, the commission's secretary who was approved by Rutskoy's directive in the second half of March, was introduced to the session's participants. In the past Zayka was Moscow's first deputy chief military prosecutor, after which he was Rutskoy's assistant for legal questions. In accordance with the Statute on the Interdepartmental Commission, the commission's secretary automatically receives the rank of lieutenant general. The fact that the commission's secretary, who under the statute is the top man in this working organ, has been appointed signifies the beginning of the implementation of a range of specific measures to fight crime and corruption.

[Article contains the following boxed text]

The interdepartmental commission's proposals requiring consideration in Security Council sessions:

The creation within the CIS framework of an interdepartmental organ to coordinate the fight against crime and to detect interregional criminal communities and corrupt groupings.

The preparation of treaties with foreign countries on giving legal assistance in criminal, civil, and other cases.

The organization of a working meeting of representatives of the CIS countries in which resilient organized criminal groupings are operating.

Article Argues Need for Russian Unity

PM0504130593 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 2

[Article by observer Aleksandr Golts: "How Many Enemies Can One Seek?"]

[Text] Esteemed readers, can you hear a soft, even, muffled thumping constantly reverberating on the streets and in the sessions halls? It is the participants in the congresses, meetings, and processions tearing their imported designer shirts or their semi-fancy cress Russian shirts and beating their breasts. Both groups swear loyalty to Russia and an abiding wish to defend it. Wearing thin Stolypin's phrase, they all shout about how they need a great Russia but, alas, so far it is the outlines of great upheavals which emerge most palpably from this shouting.

Before this happens, before we charge at each other, perhaps it is worth considering: In what does Russia's greatness actually consist? In order at least to understand against what or whom it must be defended. In my view this greatness is determined primarily by the country's enormous potential: its vast territory, its ability to supply itself with any natural resources. Its greatness is undoubtedly determined by its thousand-year history which has created an unrepeatable civilization and by its considerable contribution to world culture. Finally and probably most importantly it is determined by the national character which has formed in a state which has constantly defended its right to life, a national character

which has frequently demonstrated the ability to rise to perform exploits, to rise to self-sacrifice, to truly great moral and spiritual heights.

So who then is threatening our integrity, our historical and cultural values? Today at the congresses and meetings it is sometimes said that there is some foreign plan to conquer Russia which is now being implemented. There is no denying that the Western states are pursuing their policy with regard to our country on the basis by no means of love for it but for their own national interests. And these interests vary. For instance, the West is far from delighted at the possibility of acquiring in Russia a competitor for its traditional arms and high-technology markets. Moreover, Japan, for instance, does not conceal its desire to resolve in its favor the territorial dispute with Russia. But the point is that today these calculations obviously come second to considerations of their own safety. That is why sensible Western politicians do not want a civil war, which would threaten not only us but also all mankind, to begin in Russia, which possesses a gigantic military potential and primarily a nuclear potential

And again not only and not so much because they are so anxious for a democratic life for Russians, but primarily because they do not want to deal once more with an unpredictable military superpower controlled by a dozen elderly leaders. A country which through confrontation tries to implement some messianic ideas. But surely the interests of Western states coincide with our own here? Surely we do not want to live again in a state bristling with weaponry, a state which was, no, not respected, but morally feared?

Of course, it would be very rash to state that there is no external threat today. We live in too unstable a world. Regional conflicts are developing at our own borders. It would be even rasher to believe that new threats will not appear in the future. Authoritative analysts speak of the possibility of the emergence of serious contradictions between existing centers of power. The emergency of new centers is not ruled out either. Naturally, all this may affect Russia in one way or another.

I think it is not worth idealizing the West's good intentions that far. When people say, as Ostap Bender would say, that in any case "people abroad will help us," we only have to swear our loyalty to democracy more loudly—that is essentially just as over simplified and naive as the search for some Western plot against Russia. This primitive pro-Western approach can only do harm, because it merely pushes our opponents to speak more loudly of "betrayal of the state's interests," "a pro-Western political course," and so forth.

It is probably finally time to learn to see life and the situation in the international arena in a realistic way, as it is, and the entire complex, diverse, contradictory dialectic of interests which does not fit into simple slogans, formulas, or recipes.

The West will probably nonetheless offer real assistance to economic reforms in Russia. But only in one case—if it sees an utterly specific interest in this, a specific advantage.

Think about the figures cited recently by THE NEW YORK TIMES. The FRG will need to spend $100 billion to modernize the former GDR; South Korea, if it is united with North Korea, will have to spend $1 trillion. Compare that with Russian scales.

We are up to our ears in problems, as the saying goes. But to seek their root somewhere at a tangent, in someone's intrigues, in someone's malice, means deluding ourselves. The very same thing can be said of the countless attempts to seek enemies within the country. The "red-browns," "pseudodemocrats," "communist revanchists" and pro-Western "agents of influence," the "betrayers of Russia's interests" and the "enemies of reforms." Too many such labels are applied in society. And those who do it will never understand that there is not the slightest degree of constructiveness in all this. Of course, among the supporters of a particular political line there can be and, alas, often are, extreme radicals, extremists. And in the present explosive situation they can play the role of a fuse. But nonetheless the main danger does not come from them.

The problem is far more serious. Today, if you like, Russia must be defended primarily from each one of us. Or to be more precise from the colossal disturbance which reigns in minds and hearts. The disturbance which seems to be ruling many politicians' actions. The disturbance which is leading to universal collapse. Its source is obvious. It is the spirit of revolutionary impatience. Everyone, from leaders to ordinary citizens, wants today, right now, freedom without responsibility, the maximum quantity of rights and the minimum amount of duties, social protection, the stabilization of currency, the structural transformation of industry, and the cessation of the production slump. Well, since it is simply impossible to achieve all these aims simultaneously, enemies begin to appear. Against whom a complete and definitive victory must of course be won. And everyone is already submerged in the elements of struggle, meetings, and clashes. And the struggle is being transformed from a means into an intoxicating end in itself.

In the heat of the struggle its initial aims are somehow forgotten. Let us recall that the confrontation of the powers seems to have arisen because of different attitudes toward economic reform. But now it is obvious that because of the referendum and possible early elections this reform itself could be put off for many months.

Everyone would seem to recall the looming threat of collapse. Everyone would seem to be calling for consensus. But you note that each attempt to achieve such consensus inevitably develops into an even larger confrontation. Some common ground is needed for consensus. And not only legal ground but also—do not be afraid—ideological ground. It is a case of a nationwide

idea (of course, it has nothing in common with nationalist ravings). After all, a serious mistake was made when, having rejected the system of communist ideology, the builders of the new Russia suggested in exchange only democratic values which even they had only poorly assimilated. Yet it is not hard to note that, by following these values, various states are adjusting them to fit, to fit their own national character.

A democratic social system and market relations, to which there is indeed no civilized alternative, are being implemented in different ways in, for instance, the United States and Britain, and in a completely different way in Japan. In some places greater priority is given to individual freedom. And in another the emphasis has been shifted toward citizens' equality. Ultimately that is where the nationwide idea is embodied. An idea which has great constructive force.

It would be too bold to try to formulate this idea in some newspaper notes. I can only convey my feeling that it is essential. And perhaps precisely now that confrontation is mounting in society the time has come to close the mouths opened wide to shout at meetings. And to think calmly about what actually unites us all living in this enormous world named RUssia. Perhaps the desire to preserve it for our children...

Comment Sees Reformers' Triumph at Congress

MK0304075093 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 4

[Viktor Bondarev "Political Review": "President's Shock Therapy"]

[Text] There is hardly any need to prove that Russia needs economic and political reforms. But this obvious truth is being instilled badly. Only Gaydar's shock therapy overcame the deadlock in transforming the economy. We can see now that in the political sphere, too, we cannot manage without radical methods—the president's actions can also be called shock therapy, but this time in politics. It has also produced a result: This year we will most likely have both a new constitution and a new parliament.

From a formal viewpoint Khasbulatov was right to express his satisfaction with the results of the Congress: The president's edicts were suspended, the antipresidential parliamentary majority increased numerically, the omnipotence of the soviets was confirmed, the offensive against the mass media was continued, and the speaker himself kept his post after a little nervous strain. As for the referendum, Khasbulatov and his "comrades" apparently have nothing to worry about here, because the president, with due regard for the political activeness of citizens and the nonparticipation of a number of autonomous entities, has to get approximately 80 (!) percent of the votes—this was the "wise" decision of the Congress. It is obvious that such an outcome is utterly unlikely! You get the impression, however, that Khasbulatov is already ceasing to be the leading opposition figure and that he has been succeeded by a whole team of Khasbulatovs from the CPSU, who might well take over from him at any moment.

And yet it is possible to say without particular exaggeration that in the last few days of March the democrats won a victory at least over themselves, over their own apathy, indecision, and lack of organization. And the opponent incurred substantial moral losses. It was not the failure of impeachment—it was known even before the Congress that the opposition would not have the required majority—but the inclusion of broad sections of the population in the struggle for democracy, the consolidation of democratic forces around the president, and the government's clear political position that were the chief political results.

The Ninth Congress of People's Deputies should not be viewed separately from the two previous ones, if only because the president had first announced his appeal to the people for a mandate of confidence back at the Seventh Congress, and the ninth "gathering" of the people's elected representatives finally recognized this presidential right.

By last December the president and his apparatus, part of which was the government, found itself the only political force championing economic reform and a civilized foreign policy. The democrats had left the streets and squares, on television the creative intelligentsia was cursing all politicians indiscriminately, the soviets were being communized, and parliament had passed entirely to the control of the reaction, whose ranks had begun to be swelled rapidly by renegade democrats and "centrists." The latter were apparently campaigning for compromise, while in fact demanding capitulation and the suspension of reforms. Under those conditions Yeltsin was forced to agree to a sharp exacerbation of the situation and secured a temporary compromise. It subsequently turned out that he had succeeded in preserving the economic and foreign policy course. His actual "revolt," however, clearly showed the weakness of Yeltsin's position: The president was supported only by a few dozen deputies, while the "power ministers" obviously hesitated and clearly were not ready for decisive actions, and the opposition of every stripe had come to believe in its own strength and impunity.

It is natural that the opposition, scenting the closeness of victory, was unable to stop at what had been achieved. It was joined by the Constitutional Court, and the newly revived Communist Party stood in the vanguard of the struggle against democracy. But the Eighth Congress showed that the situation was changing. The clear signs of imminent communist revenge stimulated the democrats into greater activeness. The rejection of the referendum and the overtly boorish conduct of the leadership and of the whole of parliament gave the president psychological trump cards in his struggle for people's sympathies. It was also a very important fact that the government headed by a premier who possesses real

authority in the echelons of power announced its presence as an independent political force, albeit not very actively. Feeling certain support, the president switched to a counteroffensive.

Yeltsin's decision to hold a vote on confidence in the president—at first glance a suicidal decision under conditions of a very acute economic crisis—restored his lost rating to a considerable extent and elicited a response from the intelligentsia. The counteraction by communists and national-patriots in the streets with red banners and overtly fascist slogans and the excesses of the national-communist press clearly showed that the red-brown threat is not an invention of journalists. This danger finally impinged on the consciousness of a significant section of the creative intelligentsia and brought tens of thousands of people to the streets. It is also a very important fact that the president came to the Ninth Congress with a strong government, which openly and unequivocally supported him, including the "power" ministers. This circumstance should be emphasized particularly: Of course, demonstrations make an impression, but what is needed is real control levers and real power structures. The West's moral support also played its part in changing the situation. And yet the position of the president and his radical actions, which served as a kind of shock therapy for Russia, were the starting point for the imminent breakthrough. Incidentally, therapy, as is known, presupposes quite moderate means of treatment, without surgical intervention. The fact that a real opportunity has now emerged in Russia to continue the reforms and to avert national-communist revenge is due, to a considerable degree, precisely to Yeltsin's radical actions. Of course, a definite role has also been played by a number of positive changes in the economy and by people getting accustomed to the new living conditions and understanding the irreversible nature of the changes.

It is not hard to predict that the struggle will not end either before or after 25 April. But now it is already possible to talk of the presence of a real political force which is in a position, by using nonviolent methods, to fight and win. At the same time it is necessary to make a sober assessment of the situation, the real balance of forces, and the still existing danger of civil war. In these conditions it is hardly advisable to reject completely all possibility of compromise and issue ultimatums to the president, as his leaders did at the rally. After all, ultimately it is Yeltsin who will have to take personal responsibility for everything. Right now the democrats' task lies elsewhere—to ensure victory in the referendum, naturally in accordance with the Law on the Election of the President. It will be extremely difficult to do this. For example, it is hard to imagine that 30 million pensioners will vote for Yeltsin. There are also many other social groups on whose support he cannot count. Probably only young people's mass participation in the referendum could decide the struggle's outcome in favor of the reforms and democracy. How can this be achieved? The democrats must find the answer to this question.

Communist Party Leaders Hold News Conference

PM0604085193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 2

[Valentina Nikiferova report: "Russian Federation Communist Party Looks for Allies"]

[Text] Describe the situation in the country. Give your forecast for it. Tell us about the Communist Party's activities after its registration, journalists asked at a press conference organized by the Russian Federation Communist Party Central Executive Committee Presidium.

Communist Party leaders G. Zyuganov, S. Goryacheva, V. Kuptsov, and V. Zorkaltsev did not attempt to find comforting words, but talked about how things actually are: Unfortunately the situation is going from bad to worse. It is necessary to do everything to prevent a spontaneous explosion. The deputies made the greatest possible efforts during the Ninth Congress. The president and his entourage are the main source of confrontation, and it was no accident that more than half the deputies voted against the president. Now political parties and movements, and the people themselves should have their say.

Having covered the difficult path to political revival, the Russian Federation Communist Party, numbering more than 600,000 Communists, has been registered. This is a juridical act but it plays a political role. The Communist Party, using exclusively legal, constitutional methods, will participate in preparing for and holding the referendum, V. Kuptsov explained. There is intellectual potential in the Russian Federation Communist Party, and three groups elaborating a program to extricate us from the crisis have been formed. The Russian Communists have allies. It is time for all progressive forces to act in a coordinated manner.

Interview With Communist Party Leader Zyuganov

PM0504143793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 pp 1, 2

[Interview with G.A. Zyuganov, chairman of the Russian Communist Party Central Executive Committee, by Valeriy Alekseyev; place and date not given: "The Party's Return"]

[Text] [Alekseyev] Gennadiy Andreyevich! A very important event has occurred in the life of the Russian Federation Communist Party—the registration of its statutes at the Russian Federation Ministry of Justice. It is hard to overestimate the importance of this seemingly purely formal act. The Communist Party, which is far ahead of all its other political allies and rivals in terms of its membership, has again begun to operate legally in Russia. This very fact strikingly changes the former disposition of forces in the country. So what will be the first steps of the revived party?

[Zyuganov] First of all I would note that, despite all the obstacles, the communist movement in the country did

not die for even a single day, although I nevertheless regard the term "rebirth of the party" as justified. The party is indeed being reborn as it passes through the crucible of grim ordeals, including the voluntarist ban on its activity. We had no doubt that justice would triumph.

The authorities' official recognition of the lawfulness of activity by the Russian Communist Party merely emphasizes still more obviously the truth that it is futile to close parties, just as it is futile to rewrite history, say. Thus the mass political organization that has set itself the aim of defending working people's interests has at long last acquired all legal rights and has begun work.

At the same time I would not console myself and readers of our PRAVDA with illusions regarding the party's might. Unfortunately political strength and prestige will have to be built up. Admittedly, it is good that we have said farewell to the painful ruling party syndrome, for this exaggerated self-importance on the part of the party, along with many other factors, including external factors, brought it to a crushing defeat by the early nineties. Moreover, we are no longer the only Communist Party in our beloved fatherland.

[Alekseyev] Yes, that fact is adding a particular hue to the motley spectrum of political forces in Russia and is perhaps even making it richer. But does this strengthen the communist movement itself? What is the Russian Federation Communist Party's view of its "sisters"—the other communist-oriented parties and movements? Isn't there a pressing need to pool communists' efforts?

[Zyuganov] I will begin by answering your last question. Of course the members of our party and the leadership of the Russian Federation Communist Party Central Executive Committee are bound to feel concern for the fate of the communist movement as a whole in our country, for all communist parties share the same social base and in principle common aims. So it is clear that the fact that the general communist movement is fragmented benefits only our political opponents. At a Russian Federation Communist Party Central Executive Committee Presidium session recently we discussed this question and reached the view that the time has come to move toward closer collaboration among all communist-oriented parties and movements. The people are growing swiftly poorer, the economic situation is deteriorating sharply, democracy is in jeopardy, and human rights are being flouted. In these conditions disunity among communists is an impermissible luxury. We intend shortly to appeal to the leadership of all the country's communist parties and movements and get together for a consultative conference or coordination council in order to reach agreement on cooperation and common actions in working people's interests.

[Alekseyev] But surely the recent 29th CPSU Congress apparently was seeking these same aims. Did it not fulfill its tasks? In general what role did it play in the communist movement—did this congress unite the CIS communist parties in a single organization?

[Zyuganov] You know, all the communist parties that now exist on the territory of our motherland, as is well known, emerged from the debris of the old CPSU. It is not possible at the moment to dwell in detail on the reasons for the CPSU's departure from the political arena as a single party. But it has to be recognized that, along with subjective factors, objective factors also played a certain role. So it will scarcely be possible to attempt now to glue together the fragments of the unique political structure represented by the former CPSU. While using the same material as before, we must nevertheless create a new political organism. And to place it in advance, from the outset, in a unitary framework and to strictly regulate each step by the new communist parties from above, from another supercenter, by means of standardized statutes and programs would be to immediately condemn the communist movement throughout the CIS to disintegration, internal strife, mistrust, and so forth.

Nevertheless, I would not deny the obvious fact that the 29th CPSU Congress is an indicator of a tremendous desire on the part of communists to pool their efforts against the offensive of the barbaric capitalization of society instigated by the unregulated market, rampant speculation, and the pursuit of easy money at all costs.

According to my information, the 29th congress was attended by quite a considerable number of emissaries of party organizations from the real boondocks, so to speak. This was often an initiative by grassroots party structures and individual comrades.

However, it did not prove possible for the moment to create an alliance of parties at this congress. Why? If only because it was not attended by the leaders of the independent communist parties from the republics—for various reasons their central organs deemed it inexpedient to hold the 29th CPSU Congress at the present stage. This stance was taken not only by the Russian Federation Communist Party Central Executive Committee, as decided at the last plenum of our Central Executive Committee, but also by the leadership of the communist parties of Armenia, Belorussia [Belarus], Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Kirghizia [Kyrgyzstan]. After all, for there to be a really powerful alliance of strong, independent communist parties, these communist parties must really gain strength, be properly organized, and be registered in their republics, that is, begin to operate officially. And this process is under way. Almost all the parties I mentioned are now operating legally. We are waiting for Ukraine, where the republic's Supreme Soviet will, we hope, soon decide to lift the ban on the communist party's activity. So there will clearly soon be a need to convene a consultative or international conference of our communist parties in order to elaborate a common strategy of action throughout the entire expanse of our motherland.

The pooling of the efforts of all communist parties in the struggle for a better lot for their peoples must become the main task of the alliance of communists. Of course,

communists are responsible politicians, and history teaches us many things. We learn from it. For the first time in Russia communists, constitutional democrats, monarchists, Christian democrats, socialists, and other political forces that care about Russia and its people are all operating in a united front in the struggle for national-state interests. We are opposed by parties and movements and individual figures who hate the very idea of a prosperous, independent Russia and a free, spiritually strong, and economically secure Russian people and who dislike the idea of social justice and fellowship that have [plural as published] existed among our multinational people since ancient times. We can clearly see that many of our political opponents are backed by powerful forces in the Western world and also mondialist [mondialisticheskiye] structures which are foisting the "new world order" on the planet. That is why the patriots and communists who care about the state are having such a difficult time, for they are defending the motherland's freedom and independence from rigid external political and financial diktat. Alas, we are having to fight on two fronts—including against the stooges in Russia of those who pull the strings behind the scenes all over the world: the Boris Yeltsin regime.

[Alekseyev] But how can it be kept from taking disastrous steps leading to the destruction of the very statehood of Russia?

[Zyuganov] The most radical method is to remove the president from power, since there are considerable legal grounds for this, including the recent ruling by the Constitutional Court. But this should be done exclusively by legal means. I think the 25 April referendum could be a reliable mechanism for implementing this act, which would save Russia.

[Alekseyev] What is the position of the Russian Federation Communist Party Central Executive Committee on the referendum?

[Zyuganov] We in the party leadership have just discussed this question. It has been decided to mount a broad propaganda campaign among communists within the framework of existing legality. We must ensure that all voters take part in the referendum, it cannot be ignored. We call on our communist comrades to vote as follows on the questions submitted to the all-Russian referendum 25 April:

To the first question—"Do you have confidence in Russian Federation President B.N. Yeltsin?"—vote "no."

Answer the second question—"Do you approve of the socioeconomic policy implemented by the Russian Federation president and the Russian Federation Government since 1992?"—with a still more resolute "no."

The answer to the third question—"Do you think early elections for Russian Federation president should be held?"—is of course "yes."

Finally, we would think it advisable to say "no" to the fourth question: "Do you think early elections for Russian Federation people's deputies should be held?"

Why? Because the simultaneous replacement of the supreme organs of executive and legislative power would inevitably cause a general power vacuum, with all the ensuing disastrous consequences for the country. So, without in the slightest doubting the need for fresh Supreme Soviet elections on a new basis, we would nevertheless think that this should be done some time later, after the presidential elections. There is a need for a smooth and legitimate transition to power [perekhod k vlasti]. Abrupt leaps, like fresh upheavals and revolutions, will lead only to the destruction of the motherland, which we cannot allow.

Lipitskiy Admits 'Differences' Within Civic Union

OW0504123993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1104 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chairman of the Civic Union's Executive Committee Vasiliy Lipitskiy has admitted in an interview with INTERFAX that "there are differences within the bloc". However, "for ethical reasons", he declined comment on the position of Arkadiy Volskiy, who had recently dismissed the idea of a coalition government as "total nonsense". Describing the idea as very important for the union, he recalled that it had come from the all-Russia "Renewal" union, often called Volskiy's party.

Concerning a recent statement by the Parliamentary faction "Change-New Policy", critical of the Civic Union's actions at the 9 Congress of People's Deputies, Mr. Lipitskiy called it "a happening of a different kind". "We are witness to such representations by the faction for the third time already", he said and announced that the union's Executive Committee would discuss the political line of the faction in the next few days. He said that many committee members regarded the faction's steps as "going beyond the framework of agreement and centric policy in general". He made it clear that the Executive Committee's decision might be tough and force the faction to leave the union.

Head of 'President's Chancellery' Interviewed

PM0604082393 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 2

[Interview with Valeriy Semenchenko, head of the Russian Federation President's Chancellery, by Roza Sergaziyeva; place and date not given: "Climbing the Presidential 'Pyramid.' A Conversation With the Keeper of the Seal"—first three paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] I honestly confess that I went to the president's chancellery with a heavy heart. What could one learn of interest in a place where papers are shifted from desk to

desk? But once I had talked with Valeriy Semenchenko, chief of the chancellery, I changed my own opinion to the opposite. He spoke about documents as if reading a poem. He has managed to organize this necessary work so that any document, from the moment it enters the chancellery, to the moment it is sent out "into the world," spends not more than 24 hours in "traveling" through offices.

All the documents which arrive for referral to the president without fail pass through the chancellery. What kind of documents? Laws and bills, edicts and directives, correspondence of various kinds, letters from citizens and officials both from Russia and abroad, requests or advice, wishes or reflections. And also a great quantity of various kinds of information material about the activity of the government, ministries and departments, and social organizations. Bear in mind that no resumes or reports providing a brief synopsis of the contents of letters to the president are politely tendered. Only the originals. In an extreme case, if the handwriting is quite illegible, the text is reprinted and the original attached.

Valeriy Semenchenko, who has experience of work in the letters department of Moscow City Party Committee, recalls that for Grishin, for example, each day he prepared summaries of no more than eight or 10 letters. On various questions: housing, industry, transport. Everything was typed up; in the right-hand column went the name of the person to whom examination of the complaint was to be entrusted. Then the letter was unsealed and a facsimile signature placed on each form.

[Sergaziyeva] I would like to know whether Boris Nikolayev also has a facsimile signature.

[Semenchenko] Yes he does, of course, but Boris Nikolayevich in a principled fashion signs every document personally, even if he is flying or on an official trip, we report urgent documents to him.

I should mention especially the arrival in the chancellery of draft edicts and directives for the president to sign. According to the instruction existing in the apparatus of the president's administration, this type of document, prepared in structures of the government, ministries, and departments, having undergone the relevant coordination, is first of all sent to Sergey Filatov, leader of the president's administration. His secretariat is the last filter through which these documents pass before arriving in the president's chancellery. After the draft edict or directive has been signed by the leader of the administration, it is transferred to the chancellery. And having once more undergone thorough verification (for the presence of official signatures and the correctness of the format) it is referred to the president according to the established procedure for him to sign.

After the edict or directive has been signed, it is transferred to the document-issue group of the Clerical Work Administration in the president's administration, where it acquires the appropriate number in chronological order and is stamped with the date of issue. It is here that the document acquires its familiar round seal: "Chancellery of the President." The documents are sent out in accordance with a list prepared by the executant of the edict or directive in question.

The next batch of documents on the president's desk is correspondence with the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. In one file are laws awaiting signature, in another, letters to parliament.

A separate batch is for information material from the power ministries, surveys of the newspapers, news agency reports, and digests.

Classified materials are delivered to the First Department of the president's Administration of Affairs, from where, after processing and selection, they are sent to the chancellery. But the paradoxical situation we have encountered is this. Leaders at local level acquired, along with the premises of party oblast committees, encoding devices. This equipment is now being actively used, and not only documents deserving the "secret" stamp are being classified, but also documents on everyday questions: There is no money to pay wages in the region, there is no butter in the stores, but there is metal in the combine... Such information is straightaway intercepted and sent to ministries and departments. [Semenchenko ends]

All the documents listed ("plus" a report on the president's instructions) are deposited in strict order on Boris Yeltsin's desk. Valeriy Semenchenko is supposed to deal with this work before 0830 hours. Boris Nikolayevich looks through and signs the documents between phone calls, meetings, and sessions.

Yeltsin has his own scheme for working with documents. A pen containing black ink. If the president has read a letter he puts a "tick" on it. If a document does not satisfy him, he may put an exclamation mark next to some paragraph, or may return the document... without a single correction and unsigned. "That means that the chancellery has not done its job," Valeriy Semenchenko says, "perhaps even a grammatical mistake has been allowed through, and the president has found it..."

For the sake of efficiency the chief of the chancellery goes several times a day to the president's office, takes the signed documents, and sends them out "to their addressees." In the evening, when the president leaves work (and this is never earlier than 2100 hours), Valeriy Semenchenko again goes to the office, collects the remaining documents, and puts them in the safe. The key and seal of the safe are kept only by Semenchenko and his first assistant. Incidentally, in addition to the chief of the chancellery, the list of all the documents lying on the president's desk, in the obligatory order, is also known to his first assistant.

Every day the president receives 2,500-3,000 documents. There are only 22 people working in the chancellery; moreover, six of these are secretaries working in the president's reception room. They are on duty in pairs for

24 hours at a time. The remaining 16 people, working directly with documents, closely cooperate with the General Department of the Administration of Affairs in the president's administration (the structural subdepartment which carries out the first mass processing of all arriving documents). The chancellery's personnel include experts, a leading specialist, and a first category specialist. All their workplaces are equipped with IBM computers with a shared database.

But I especially liked the president's current archives, which are also situated in the chancellery. Absolutely all documents which reach Yeltsin's desk, including handwritten notes and speeches corrected in the president's hand—all these are systematized, copied, and documented. Materials from official trips, meetings with political figures—absolutely everything goes into the archive. Valeriy Semenchenko even remembers the following episode.

Once Boris Nikolayevich asked him to find his working memorandum (and this is a small sheet of paper on which he notes down key words thematically in a column) from a meeting three months earlier which he had held with President of Tatarstan Shaymiyev. The memorandum was found, and this helped Yeltsin to remember something very important.

"You are virtually the only man who forms the president's information space," I said, expressing my fears to the head of the chancellery. "Can there be objectivity in such a situation?"

[Semenchenko] I do not have the right, occupying this position, to be a politicized person. It does not matter to me whether a document has come from leaders of the government or supporters of the fervent opposition to reforms. The most important thing is for the document to contain a question which deserves the president's attention for its importance. The president has a full picture of what goes on.

[Sergaziyeva] Then here is another question. You and your staff have access to documents for which someone could pay millions. How is the necessary regime of secrecy maintained?

[Semenchenko] On the one hand, I know my staff; I have worked with some of them for many years. And on the other, the small number of people—only 16—makes the possibility of a leak virtually unrealistic. Every staffer works on his own narrow section. To calculate the "source" of a leak would be the work of a moment. But such a thing has not occurred with us. We work on trust and are proud that the president trusts us, and, the main thing, we understand that we are in the same team as the president. [Semenchenko ends]

Our information

Valeriy Semenchenko is 47 years old. By education he is an electrical engineer. In 1969 he moved to Moscow. He was called to work in the Volgogradskiy Rayon Party Committee. Then in the Moscow City CPSU Committee. There he was chief selector of letters at the time that Yeltsin arrived in the city committee. Many responsible workers were replaced, but Semenchenko remained. "And when Boris Nikolayevich was 'kicked out' of the city committee, I, like all my assistants, was 'promoted' to other work," Valeriy Semenchenko recalls. "I was elected first deputy chairman of Moscow's Volgogradskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee."

Two years later, when the new times began and democratic elections to the soviets were held for the first time, Semenchenko became a deputy of the rayon soviet; later he was elected chairman of the soviet executive committee. But he managed to work in this post only six months. Boris Yeltsin, now chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, invited him to his office. The Letters Department of the Supreme Soviet was snowed under with 75,000 unread letters. Then Semenchenko becomes head of the General Department of the Russian Supreme Soviet. Then he participated in the creation of the president's secretariat.

Referendum Issues

'Opposition' Airs Views on Ninth Congress, Referendum

LD0604102293 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 0730 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] It would seem the emotions over the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies have died down. It has passed into or, perhaps, gone down in history. Both its direct participants and the citizens of Russia have very different opinions about it. The central mass media, as you will recall, were criticized for taking up a pro-presidential stance and for not giving enough time to leaders holding a different point of view. Today, we would like to acquaint you with the assessment of the outcome of the congress of representatives of the Rossiya parliamentary faction. Over to our correspondent Andrey Babayev.

[Babayev] Just before the congress, and during it, a wide variety of rumors were being spread to the effect that Yeltsin wanted to do away with the congress and that military units were being brought toward Moscow, and so on. However, few people know that the opposition forces made very real preparations to repulse such measures. Andrey Leonidovich Andreyev, leader of the Russian Popular Alliance [Rossiyskiy Obshchenarodnyy Soyuz] and coordinator of the Rossiya faction, stated at a news conference that opposition supporters monitored the situation.

[Andreyev] "Both the Russian Popular Alliance and other patriotic organizations were prepared to repulse strong-arm methods from the executive authorities if they had been used. In this connection, an operational

plan of resistance was worked out. For example, resistance to the introduction of troops. We have no weapons and we have never had them, but our strength lies in the sphere of popular resistance. We are certain that had such strong-arm action been taken, that would have been the final day of the present regime's existence, because today, soldiers are not going to oppose the people. Nevertheless, we monitored the situation. We had observation and early-warning groups, including some on the distant approaches to Moscow. Several headquarters existed in parallel and there was an operational plan for deploying, so to speak, popular resistance forces if that had been required. A guard regiment was formed comprising up to 1,000 persons, which existed for as long as the threat of such an unforeseen extreme development of events lasted. This regiment was used to guard the parliament and was also used at mass events."

[Babayev] Sergey Baburin, leader of the Rossiya parliamentary faction, believes that the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation fulfilled its main task.

[Baburin] "This task was to take urgent steps to preserve the Russian Federation's constitutional order. The congress carried out this task. We insisted on the impeachment of Russian Federation President Yeltsin, and the majority of deputies of our faction favored the resignation of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, though this matter is not at all a simple one and even in our faction there were different points of view, not to mention the fact that the other factions of the Russian unity bloc occupied a different stance on the matter of the impeachment according to Khasbulatov's plan.

"Nevertheless, the simple fact that in the secret ballot the president received 617 votes in favor of his impeachment makes us bewildered to see the declaration of a triumphant victory by supporters of the president. One can merely say today that the congress was unable to call him to account, but this can be done by the people at the referendum set for 25 April. We hope that on 25 April, in spite of the psychosis being whipped up, above all by television and radio, we will be able to assess the situation correctly—by we, I mean both deputies and nondeputies, all citizens of the Russian Federation—and realise the need for radical changes and the need to stop the collapse, and that a decision will be made on a vote of no confidence in President Yeltsin at the referendum, and if this is demanded, on the reelection of deputies as well."

[Babayev] Sergey Baburin assesses the activity of the Constitutional Court positively.

[Baburin] "Had it not been for the determination of the Constitutional Court and personally of Valeriy Zorkin, its chairman, had it not been for the unity of the Constitutional court, the Supreme Soviet and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, of the procurator general and the procuracy, the vice president and a significant section of the executive bodies, had it not been for our regional organizations calling for people to take part in their unity in defending the Constitution, who knows what might have followed the president's address on 20 March? The congress adopted the decision on the referendum. You know that four questions have been put forward. Indeed, we were ready to set the date for early elections without putting forward questions for the referendum. We, very many people in our faction, believed it possible, in the first question, of whether you trust the president or not, to agree with the president and leave it as 50 percent of those taking part in the vote, because we are certain that those who do come to vote will voice a vote of no confidence in the president. He flatters himself in vain that Russia's Vesti program or Russia's Radio decide everything. We have learned to think independently and this is indeed thanks to the last few years. And undoubtedly we believe that the congress decision on the mass media, which has laid the basis for the eradication of monopolism in this sphere, should be rigorously implemented. We hope that our supporters in the regions and members of our regional organizations will call for people to take part in this referendum in order to express a vote of no confidence in the president and a vote of no confidence in the economic and political policy being pursued by the president and his government, and to demand early elections."

[Announcer] Well, one can agree or disagree with the views of the opposition, but they probably do have the right to be heard.

Shumeyko Interviewed on Referendum, Elections

OW0504124793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1224 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shumeyko told INTERFAX on Monday [5 April] in an exclusive interview that only two of the four propositions put up for the April 25 referendum mattered to President Boris Yeltsin and his team: that on confidence in the president, and that on a new parliamentary election. "We're not really interested in the other propositions," he added.

Shumeyko believes that if more than 50 percent of those taking part in the voting answered in the affirmative to the question whether they trusted Yeltsin, the president would be justified in continuing his policy. If, however, more than half of the total registered electorate said yes, the president would be perfectly justified in convening a constitutional assembly which would pass a new constitution and call a new parliamentary election, the deputy prime minister thinks.

Shumeyko fears, at the same time, that a new parliamentary election would be extremely difficult to hold even if Yeltsin won the referendum. "When I worked in the Supreme Soviet, we passed a law under which it is practically impossible to recall a deputy," he said. "A new electoral law will be considered and passed by the

deputies themselves, and they will pass a law under which it would be impossible to re-elect any of them before his term expired," he said.

In his opinion, Parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov failed to have his positions strengthened at the last Congress of People's Deputies. "Today no politician can have strong positions if he doesn't go in step with the general development of Russia. I don't really think that either the people's deputies or Ruslan Imranovich (Khasbulatov) himself are going in step with Russia's development," he said.

Electoral Chairman: Observers Not Needed for Referendum

OW0504184393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1619 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chairman of the Central Electoral Committee of the Russian Federation Vasiliy Kazakov said in an interview with Interfax that he does not see the need for bringing in UN representatives to observe the conducting of the April 25 referendum.

Commenting on the statement from UN General Secretary Butrus Butrus-Ghali announcing that the UN was prepared to send representatives to Russia to observe the referendum if so asked, Kazakov stressed that such a practice would not be accepted by any developed nation. He feels this might be legitimate in developing countries of the Third World, but certainly not in such a superpower as Russia, which has about 100,000 electoral districts.

Representatives of Russian political parties and associations are fully capable of overseeing the conducting of the referendum, said Kazakov. This was proven in the presidential elections in June, 1991, which had no registered gross violations of the law, he said.

Yeltsin Reaction to Congress Referendum Maneuvers Viewed

PM0504145593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 8

["Editorial Viewpoint": "President's Supporters Could Influence Referendum Results by Operating Within The Law"]

[Text] The impeachment that never was inspired the legislators to look for more sophisticated ways of achieving their main aim. In approving the questions and the procedure for holding the referendum, the Congress did its utmost to get the president removed from power in this way (formally speaking, in a legal manner; in fact, by sharp practice).

The question about "socioeconomic policy" looks like a marked card, and the "holding of early elections for people's deputies" without indicating a specific date is a cheat. And the condition that the referendum should be considered valid if at least 50 percent of the voters on the electoral roll have participated is dishonest and certainly impracticable (apparently, Yeltsin, who 48 million Russians voted to elect, now has to get at least 50 million votes just to get his legal powers confirmed).

The best thing the president and his supporters can do at what is a critical time for them is to respond to this dishonest play by playing an honest game. That was probably why Yeltsin and his team rejected the idea of holding a parallel plebiscite involving a set of different questions. According to Sergey Filatov, head of the president's administration, "we should not be dissipating our forces at this time; we would be better advised to concentrate on preparing for one event, particularly as the referendum is backed up by legislation and, therefore, the process of preparation for it, holding of it, and the counting of votes will, in particular, be supervised by the Prosecutor's Office."

The likelihood is that Yeltsin will not accept the referendum conditions imposed on him by the Congress. Although there has been only one petition so far to the Constitutional Court from the presidential side—to examine the constitutionality of the impeachment procedure organized at the Congress. But society is entitled to expect the president to demand that the question of confidence in his socioeconomic policy be removed from the voting paper and replaced by a question on the new Constitution; that the voting producedure be changed, so that an expression of support (for him or for the deputies) in accordance with the formula "50 percent of the number of people participating in the vote plus one vote" is deemed sufficient. Society is also entitled to expect the Constitutional Court to react to these petitions (they will be submitted, Filatov announced, as soon as the Congress decrees come into effect following publication) with the same impressive speed as it responded to the president's appeal to the people.

But the resolute activeness of a president intent on touring the country and holding a series of consultations with representatives of various parties and movements and people's deputies is no substitute now for activeness on the part of society, its mature majority, and all who hold freedom, democracy, and reforms dear. In a situation that has been inflamed by the National Salvation Front and by communist forces, it is important not only to keep calm, but also to stop the provocative rumors (about alleged mass dismissals on the way, about the government's "intention" to raise fuel prices), to prevent calls for confrontation, and refrain from street methods of political struggle.

Finally, and most important: Public bodies should be set up to supervise electoral commissions' activities. Voting organization and procedure, counting of votes, and interpretation of results—all this has to be monitored by democratic parties and movements. The will of the people can only be expressed within the framework of the law.

Referendum Question on Economy 'Meaningless'

PM0504145693 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 8

[Leonid Batkin article: "How To Vote on 'Question Two'"]

[Text] First, something all too obvious. Every one of us who is inclined to give the matter even a moment's thought realizes that this question ("Do you support the socioeconomic policy implemented by the president and government since 1992?") is absolutely meaningless, not only legally, but in general.

Because, first, the "socioeconomic policy" is a very complex package of measures of different natures and different thrusts, rather like Trishka's coat [reference to fable in which Trishka tries to patch holes in his coat by cutting bits off elsewhere]. I myself, for instance, approve of some of them, others I consider dubious, and others again I regard as totally mistaken.

Second, this policy as it is conceived and formulated in legislation is one thing, but as it is "implemented" is, alas, another. And the inconsistencies and failures may be the direct fault of the president or his government, or they may be (and it would be interesting to know how you could assess the proportions) a problem they share with us, the result of the combination of a great many different difficulties, errors, and circumstances.

Third, a "socioeconomic policy" was pursued not only by executive bodies, but also by legislative bodies, and the Russian Federation Central Bank, amazingly, even has its very own policy, at cross purposes with the reforms. And while all these influential "branches," twigs, and berries of our country's power differ among themselves, nothing is sanctified without the Supreme Soviet and the Congress itself.

This is a composite policy, confirmed by the legislators too (or else distorted by them: just try and get to the bottom of that, dear voter!) through the 1992 laws and through the budget. It is the policy and the responsibility of all the powers (let us not forget to include here the conduct of the regional bosses and the state of the apparatus of the inherited "vertical" structure). In short, of the Russian power system as a whole. So the words "by the president and government" are rather dishonest.

Fourth, an economic policy is never "implemented" in the space of a year, least of all a policy of transition from one socioeconomic system to another. It was futile for B. Yeltsin to promise in the first place that the first marked improvements would come next fall.

But that is not the main point. The point is that this question (basically: "Are you satisfied with life?" or "Has life gotten better and brighter?" or "Have we chosen the right path, comrades?") is either too simplistic or too enigmatic (concealing a whole collection of supplementary, more detailed questions). Simplistic, because 70-80 percent of the population will obviously answer "no." And maybe all 100 percent, because even the emergent Russian business has all too many reasons for dissatisfaction. Everyone is complaining, except, no doubt, for petty speculators and thieves. Everyone, including the authors of the reforms themselves, starting with Ye. Gaydar, and even the president—is anyone satisfied with the policy that has been "implemented"? And enigmatic, because a question like that would require an answer **stating reasons.**

"No"—because we should return to an edict-based, distributive economy, the one that "must be economical"? To state regulation of prices and wages? Or because we should continue the same policy, only more slowly and circumspectly, aiming to reach the market eventually, in, say, 15-20 years' time? Or because we should pursue this same "macroeconomic" policy, but really rigorously, without giving way to any kind of "pressure," without disastrous subsidies to everyone who "puts the pressure on," and without trying to pretend right up until December 1992 that "in the main" the proclaimed course is indeed being implemented? Or "no" because we have not actually gone over to radical structural transformations of ownership relations? Because real, fundamentally revolutionary reforms (primarily agrarian reform) **have not yet even begun?**

Incidentally, back in fall 1991 I was an opponent of the policy that had at that time only just been outlined by the then totally unknown (including to me) and not yet appointed Gaydar—purely for the last of all the abovementioned reasons. And in summer 1992 I expressed sharp objections in a letter (along with my comrades in the "Independent Civic Initiative") to the president, again on the basis of the very last of all these reasons. Messrs. Rutskoy, Travkin, etc., on the other hand, are saying "no" from an entirely different viewpoint. And B. Yeltsin and Ye. Gaydar would doubtless themselves utter a disappointed "no" from their own, third viewpoint.

So when the voters say a unanimous "no," how is this to be interpreted? Things are still very bad and no one can approve of that. But will the "no" be a protest against the movement toward a free market economy and private ownership? Or does "no" mean that it is time to move seriously and more quickly in that direction? Is it "no" to excess in the reforms? Or "no" to their timid, half-hearted, and illusory nature? Which of these things is the reason for their inevitably but, at the moment, excessively painful nature?

There is not much hope that the so-called Constitutional Court, meaning its majority headed by Mr. Zorkin, which has put all its money in the political totalizator on a horse from the stable of extraordinary Congresses, with elegant jockeys from the "Supreme Soviet Presidium"—that this court, which is remarkable of its kind, will revoke a question the answer to which can have no legal significance or even any clear political significance and is not even any good for a carefully compiled sociological poll. So how should we vote?

There you have the "political art" of people like the speaker, an art which NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA editor Mr. Tretyakov presented—or, as they would put it, turned into "soundbites"—for Yeltsin's edification the other day—oh, so brilliantly! There you have the very model of the new Soviet guile, the unabashed fairground cheating of politickers' "moves" designed to ensure that a tired and embittered country, with no legal experience and every reason to be dissatisfied, gives the answer that is **wanted.** There you have the "art of the possible"!

As for answering the question, I myself, to be honest, am not capable of it. I would have to strike out both "yes" and "no." But... then my voting paper will be deemed invalid. At the same time it is absolutely essential to answer "yes" to questions one and four. (And, of course, "no" to question three, which is also idiotic enough, since it is covered by question one). This is also essential from the viewpoint of people who, like me, do not see themselves as "Yeltsin supporters." However, it is possible (and necessary) to argue intensively with the Yeltsin leadership, **civilized opposition is possible** here, and that includes partnership as well as support on individual specific questions—opposition "from the left" (in the sense that this word used to have in this country), from consistently democratic, liberal, independent civic standpoints. And there is still hope for public support and deepening of the reforms.

As for those whom Metropolitan Ioann of St. Petersburg and Ladoga recently called a "horde," a "scourge," and so forth, the wreckers of Russia (or was the metropolitan not referring to the people we saw again on our tv screens for four days?)—it is inconceivable to have dealings with the reactionaries who went on the rampage at the Congress. They were deafened by their own cries. They were driven crazy by the smell of unlimited power, revenge, a triumph that seems close at hand and attainable. They got carried away. Therefore, irrespective of your attitude to the president and to the "executive power" in general, it is vitally important as quickly as possible to remove the extreme reactionary section of the "top strata" from the helm of the ship of state.

People say that "this is no time for nuances, there is no time to think about whether you are for the reds or the whites," and so forth. This is a terrible mistake, in my view, if we are interested in what will happen the morning **after** the referendum. There is always time to think. The idea of the "lesser evil," a black-and-white, simplistic idea designed for your "own side"—that is not an intelligent or democratic idea. Only rich nuances, only carefully considered, declared motives are important (also in order to be able to add up the votes, in practice). People should not vote simply "for Yeltsin," but on the basis of an honest and complete set of considerations, for the sake of the present **eve**—I hope—of real democracy.

If, as is promised, the four questions are presented on separate voting papers, then I will be able to express my attitude to question two on its own. I will cheerfully strike out both "yes" and "no." Or I will strike out neither. But I will not take this voting paper home, of course, so as to avoid knowingly making it easier to cook the results of the vote. I will "spoil" it. After all, it is already spoiled.

Rutskoy Aide Urges Post-Referendum 'Nonaggression Pact'

MK0604095293 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Report by Andrey Fedorov, adviser to Russian vice president, under the "Opinion" rubric: "Most Dangerous Thing Is Different Interpretations of Referendum Results. Political 'Nonaggression' Pact Needed After Poll"]

[Text] Given all the complexity of Russia's political life, it is essential to understand that 25 April is not a new start for Russia, nor is it a Rubicon which, if crossed, will catapult us into us a different country with a different legal framework and different political forces around us.

The upcoming referendum is merely yet another trial of strength, which this time is put openly to the people's judgment. At the same time, saying that the people themselves want this showdown would be fairly far-fetched. There are many indications pointing to the contrary: The people are afraid of that showdown because only the most naive believe that peace and stability will break out after the referendum's results are counted.

I believe that in reality everything will evolve in a somewhat different manner. Whatever the actual numeric outcome of the referendum, what will be of primary importance is who gives the first interpretation of the results, where and when they will do so, and what specific actions will follow those assessments. Here, again, one has to realize clearly that once the referendum is held, the room for agreement between the branches of power is bound to shrink, as is the room for interpretation itself. The logic of Russia's political life may, should the referendum produce inconclusive results amenable to different interpretations, raise the classic question of Russian revolutions dating back to the beginning of the century: "Who will prevail over whom?"

This is why we should take right now a very serious approach to creating a sort of a "life buoy" that will make it impossible for the political confrontation to rise to a qualitatively new level.

The crux of the matter is that both sides involved in the conflict should reach agreement in advance that parallel interpretations of the referendum results will be ruled out and that those results will by no means prompt the president or the parliament to make reckless moves.

The referendum's results should first of all become a starting point for comprehending the situation in Russia

and the Russians' attitude to what is going on, and not a springboard for radical actions. Only in this event will we be able to achieve at least a temporary truce between the warring sides, which is essential given the worsening economic and financial crisis. It would be wise if this "noninterpretation pact" regarding the referendum results were public for all the Russians to see. This is why, I will emphasize once again, calling today for a unilateral interpretation equals to calling for a confrontation and, therefore, a disaster.

Moreover, I would say that right after the referendum is completed, the branches of power need to conclude a "nonaggression pact," which will be based on the agreement to form a national accord government that would be able to win direct support in parliament and survive even the potential election campaign.

'Democratic' Groups Support Referendum, Oppose Early Vote

OW0504133693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1224 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The social committee of Russian democratic organizations, which was formed on the basis of a "democratic round table" discussion, at its regular session on Monday [5 April] decided to support all the questions on the April 25 referendum except the question of early presidential elections. The committee is asking Russian citizens to answer no to that question.

They decided to form publicity groups in support of the referendum and the president and to delegate representatives of social committees in the Central Electoral Committee. Participants in the session adopted an appeal "On the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation," which states that the Constitutional Court has become a "political instrument of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress, bent on fighting democratic reforms." The social committee feels it is necessary to include in the referendum a question of confidence in the Constitutional Court. The committee expressed its certainty that the people will deny the court their confidence.

Propose Opinion Poll With Referendum

OW0504184493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1619 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At its session held on Monday [5 April], a public committee of Russia's democratic organizations, which unites democratic-oriented parties and movements and art and professional unions, approved an open letter to the Russian President with an appeal to undertake urgent measures to change the political situation. In particular, the President has been proposed to hold an opinion poll on April 25 simultaneously with the referendum. According to the participants of the session, it should include the following issues: on the necessity to preserve the Congress of the People's Deputies, on adoption of a new Constitution by a constituent assembly, and on legislation on private ownership of land.

The participants of the session declared in their joint statement that the 9th Congress of People's Deputies has actually usurped power and deprived Russia of legal space, using its own absolute power and the Constitutional Court, and has opened the way for the introduction of political censorship.

Under the present political situation, the public committee of Russia's democratic organizations declared that it supports the President's initiative to include issues on convocation of a constitutional assembly and on principles of new Russia's constitution to be discussed at the referendum. The public committee has called on the Russians to come to the referendum and to say "yes" to President Yeltsin, to the policy of reforms, and to re-elections of the Congress and "no" - to re-elections of the President.

Communists Appeal for 'No Confidence' Vote in Yeltsin

OW0504133893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1226 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The leaders of the Union of Communist Parties-the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (UCP-CPSU), told a news conference on Monday that the union would be urging the nation to give President Boris Yeltsin and his policy a no confidence vote at the forthcoming referendum. Oleg Shenin, chairman of the union's board, said, "If the president remains in office, Russia will face an inevitable collapse." This would mean the disintegration of the country's economy and political system, he said. The UCP-CPSU leadership insists that, if a new presidential election is called, a new parliamentary election should be held simultaneously with it.

Deputy board chairman Aleksey Prigarin said the new lawmakers would definitely be more left-wing than the present ones. Commenting on the results of the recent 29th congress of the CPSU, Shenin said the UCP-CPSU regarded restoration of the Soviet Union as its main purpose, to attain which it was ready to cooperate with "patriotic" forces. He said 13 communist parties from all republics of the former Soviet Union, except Armenia and Kazakhstan, had taken part in the congress, and expressed support for the idea of forming a union of communist parties. He added that Russian Communist Party leader Gennadiy Zyuganov had assured the UCP-CPSU board that his party was ready to join the union.

The UCP-CPSU mainly counted on support from the impoverished population strata, Prigarin said.

Economic Issues

Chernomyrdin Demands Solutions to Agricultural Problems

LD0504204493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By correspondent Natalya Chernyshova; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Today's meeting at the Ministry of Agriculture was initiated by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. The beginning of spring field work and the continuous fall in the volume of industrial production, including agricultural production, made him make a decision, jointly with agricultural experts, on urgent and specific measures. The premier proposed that the participants decide on the range of problems and outline acceptable solutions right here, at the meeting. Afterwards, Chernomyrdin said, I will not be accepting any explanations on why this or that was not done. We will then have nothing to discuss with these people.

The absence of means is, as always, the greatest problem. Therefore, there is not enough money for fertilizers, spares, fuel, and seeds. It was decided to speed up the injection of credits into industry. It is necessary to give credits to organizations at the level of oblast departments for agricultural supplies and of factories, in order to maintain a targeted supply of credits. At the same time it is necessary to agree with managers in the near future on shipments without waiting for payments in advance.

The premier gave instructions to heads of ministries and promised to sign a decree on 7 April on stabilizing agro-industrial production. He also said he intends to discuss the progress in the sowing campaign with regional representatives.

Officials Analyze Farmers' Problems

LD0504173493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1458 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Current economic problems in Russia should not be allowed to "paralyze spring field work," Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin said today opening a meeting of the Agriculture Ministry's collegium, which also involved Russian ministry and agency officials.

Chernomyrdin formulated the goal of today's meeting as follows: "To learn what hamstrings spring field work and to remove these problems." He emphasised that agricultural work is "the number one problem in Russia in this moment."

Agriculture Minister Viktor Khlystun described the general situation in the industry "as the sharp deterioration in the economic position of rural commodity producers," noting that in the first months of this year "they did not even had means to carry out the sowing." Khlystun observed that "credits were significantly late to come." according to him, four problems are typical for the russian countryside today: "the shortage of farm machinery, fuel and lubricants, seeds and fertilizers."

Khlystun also told the collegium that seeds have already been sowed on 1.2 million hectares and some 1.2 per cent of winter crops rotted.

The area allotted to cereals will increase by one million hectares in 1993. "The last two months have shown signs of stabilisation in animal breeding. The industry achieved the increase in milk production per cow for the first time in three years," he said.

Khlystun stressed that the government ought to take additional measures to stabilise the situation in the agro-industrial sector, specifically to issue additional credits to the industry.

Following 90 minutes of the dynamic discussion of problems involved in the plowing season in Russia, the collegium adopted a range of decisions. For instance, on Chernomyrdin's proposal, a meeting between suppliers of farm output and directors of industrial plants will be held late this week to make sure that plants begin supplying equipment and spare parts for the spring field work without additional payment. It was also decided to ensure the delivery of fuel, seeds and fertilizers to farmers.

Chernomyrdin stressed in this regard: "We are losing not because we lack something but because the destroyed mechanism for supplying the countryside with resources has not yet been restored and the new mechanism has not been mastered." Chernomyrdin also declared for the equality of all forms of owernship in the countryside.

Government Establishes Fund To Support Competition

LD0504172193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Apr 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The government of the Russian Federation has set up a fund to support enterprises and the development of competition [fond podderzhki predprinimatelstva i razvitiya konkurentsii]. This year the fund will receive 25 billion rubles. It will work under the Russian Federation State Committee for Antimonopoly Policy and Support of New Economic Structures. Acting Economics Minister Andrey Shapovalyants has been appointed chairman of the fund.

Minister Says Fuel Industries' Situation 'Catastrophic'

OW0504213393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1919 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Minister of Fuel and Energetics of the Russian Federation Yuriy Shafranik said, reforms in Russia "shall not move if stabilization in the natural resources extraction industries is not accomplished." At a Monday [5 April] press-conference in Tyumen he assessed the situation at the Russia's petroleum and gas industries as "catastrophic". Nevertheless the companies of the fuel and energetics complex contribute two thirds of the State's hard currency revenues.

At the same time the Minister stressed that recently "the structure of work of the fuel and energetics complex has been reconstructed and the staff redistributed." Apart from that the Government has issued a series of "important regulations" in compliance with which the industry shall receive State investments, that are to "somehow stabilize the situation." According to Y. Shafranik, the process of privatizatizing petroleum industry enterprises has already attracted 35 Mn [million] "vouchers". However, thinks the Minister, one should not be in a hurry to privatize the enterprises of the industry for that could lead to the "the senseless fragmentation of the producing corporations." Y. Shafranik informed that Russia has fulfilled 100 percent of its obligations to the CIS partners on fuel supplies in the first two months of 1993 while only 5.5 percent of payments have been received.

The Minister says Tyumen is to become the center of the CIS premier's agreement on the development of the fuel and energetics complex of West Siberia, and Yuriy Vershinin, General Director of the "Tyumenneftegaz" corporation shall be appointed Executive Secretary of the Council of the Fuel and Energetics Ministers of The CIS.

This week Y. Shafranik plans to visit the coal-mining regions and acquaint the miners, the mine administrators and trade unions with Mintopenergo position on the issue of the development of the coal industry.

Yeltsin Signs Decree Protecting Savings Against Inflation

LD0504104893 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Text] President Yeltsin has signed an ordinance on the steps for compensation of the people's inflation-corroded deposits in the State Savings Bank. The paper comes shortly after a similar document adopted by the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies, but in economy experts' view the president's scheme is more realistic. Both blueprints attempt to index 100 billion rubles since January last year.

The (?congressional) scheme will require 30,000 billion rubles. At stage one it could be funded from the budget, and at stage two the state will issue bonds redeemable in 10 years. With inflation of 2,500 percent last year, the depositor's right to draw money from his or her account, and the interest on the refunding of the budget, the scheme may recreate a problem of the ruble overhang. As for the bonds, they can be guaranteed by capital investment and real estate, which can make the interest in the privatization checks auctioning less attractive to the people.

On the other hand, President Yeltsin's decree says that protection of people's deposits must be effected through a system of insurance bank deposits, similar to those existing in the developed Western countries and based upon a federal insurance fund. The fund will be formed out of deductions by commercial banks that service individual deposits, and by budget allocations.

Meanwhile, the president's decree suggests that the Central Bank does the indexing of small deposits using 400 billion rubles worth of assets of the Russian Committee for Precious Metals.

Deputy Prime Minister Chubays Discusses Privatization

LD0304225393

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1405 GMT on 3 April carries the regular 45-minute "Red Square" program presented by Aleksandr Lyubimov. The topic under discussion this week is privatization. Russian Deputy Prime Minister Anatoliy Chubays is the main studio guest, with Yuriy Medvedev, chairman of the Volgograd oblast State Committee for Property, and studio commentator Andranik Migranyan as further participants.

The program begins with a 1.5-minute film on the history of privatization in Russia, which contains the following information: "In April-May last year approximately 3,000 enterprises a month were being privatized, in October-November it was 6,000, and by December it was up to 12,000 enterprises. Thus, in total, as of 1 January, 1993, 46,815 enterprises had been privatized in Russia. On the whole this was privatization of small enterprises - trade, catering, communal services. As of 1 January the proportion of private enterprises in these spheres were 32, 34, and 36 percent respectively."

The film also reveals that the issuing of privatization checks ended on 31 January and that 96 percent of the population had received them. "The Russian Federation State Committee for Property summed up the results of the privatization process as of 1 February, 1993. From the composite information: 54,000 enterprises had been privatized."

Lyubimov begins by asking Chubays about the issue and use of privatization vouchers. He asks: "With what speed are you getting the vouchers back? How quickly are people buying state property?"

Chubays replies: "As of today we have had returned to us - or in other words, we have given the opportunity to invest vouchers to about 17-20 percent of those who have received vouchers. If you consider that it is now the end of March and that the process is accelerating with

every month, then this is a speed which will allow everyone who owns a voucher to use it by the end of 1993."

Chubays then explains where citizens can use their checks. Lyubimov then asks about the privatization of small enterprises, to which Chubays replies: "I would say that the privatization of small enterprises has already been placed on a standard, firm footing. We heard the figure 46,000 enterprises at the end of 1992, 33 percent being the proportion privatized. Now I can say that as regards the privatization of small enterprises we are reaching a proportion of 50-50. Around 50 percent of small enterprises in Russia in the next few weeks will be private enterprises, that is throughout Russia as a whole."

Chubays then says that citizens can either invest the vouchers or sell them; their value, however, is greater if they are invested. The price of vouchers is now fairly stable after previous rises and falls.

Next, there follows a six-minute video report from Volgograd which describes how the privatization process is going there. There are interviews with various enterprise managers on what it means for them and the problems they are encountering.

Lyubimov then asks Chubays about the payment of dividends. Chubays explains that the payment of dividends depends upon the company and how much it decides to pay its shareholders.

Yuriy Medvedev, chairman of the Volgograd oblast State Committee for Property, who is on a video link with the studio, then describes in more detail how people are taking up their rights to privatization vouchers in Volgograd oblast. He says that half a million vouchers have been utilized in Volgograd oblast since January this year. He discusses what kind of enterprises can be invested in.

Chubays adds to this that people understand that some enterprises are better than others, while saying that unprofitable state enterprises can become very profitable in private hands and so it can be worth investing in them.

Chubays goes on to describe the bankruptcy process, saying that this is the most drastic stage in a series of steps which could be taken in the case of an enterprise experiencing difficulties. Earlier measures could include, for example, changing the management, the administration etc.

Medvedev says that the political situation which has evolved recently makes people cautious, although in Volgograd they have a very good chance to see 80 percent of all state enterprises privatized in 1994, to which Chubays says:

"It is because of this that political confrontation has reached such an incredible point of tension at present. Because at present, after certain uncoordinated attacks, we can feel a massive offensive against both the State Committee for the Management of State Property and privatization. It is because of what you have just said that we have indeed approached the stage when it became irreversible. We have approached the situation when in a month or a month and a half no recreated communist party will be able to take the property back from people, which we are giving to them. This is the point."

Lyubimov asks whether new parties are being set up for this reason, to which Chubays replies: "Do you think it was accidental that on 1 October, when the distribution of privatization checks began in Russia, the National Salvation Front was registered?"

After a three-minute report from Yekaterinburg on the privatization process there, Chubays continues by describing how the government decided upon the method for privatization:

"Three options were proposed. As expected, the second option, when a collective has the right to acquire 51 percent of shares, has turned out to prevail. Around 60 percent have chosen this option. About 35 percent of enterprises have chosen the first option, when 25 percent of shares are handed over to a collective free. And the third option, which was experimental and it was planned as such, works in 2-3 percent of the cases. The essence of the third option is that a group of people appears at an enterprise, which receives a very big privilege - they receive the right to acquire 20 percent of the shares for a cheap price but at the same time they have to put in an enormous deposit. Each of them should put in a deposit in the form of their personal property to a total value of up to 200 minimum wages and, providing they do it, they receive the right, naturally with the collective's consent, to acquire that 20 percent. That is, in fact, they immediately receive the control package of the shares in their hands."

Migranyan asked whether there was a danger of the so-called fourth option being implemented. Chubays replies:

"There is such a threat. This is one of the several directions of the main blows which the opposition delivers on privatization at present, aiming at destroying it before it becomes irreversible. The so-called fourth option is a method when 90 percent are handed over to the enterprise itself practically free, for the nominal price, and, moreover, at the expense of the enterprise's profit. In other words, it takes the property from those who find ourselves overboard the enterprise and passes it into the hands of those who already have a very big privilege. The main thing is, not a single enterprise, not a single collective put forward this demand. This demand is put forward by these communist movements, which, according to your optimistic forecast, Aleksandr, are very unlikely to come to power. This is one direction of the blow. There is a number of others.

"While we are discussing this matter here, I have just come from a sitting of the Supreme Soviet which at this very moment is voting on a resolution of the Supreme Soviet and proposals to prohibit check auctions - put forward by a group of deputies from the 'Smena' faction, there is somebody called Polozkov there who is a great fan of check auctions - have been included in this resolution. There are also proposals there to stop privatization as a matter of fact and, of course, to dismiss Chubays."

Migranyan asks whether the privatization process is stable enough to be irreversible, to which Chubays says:

"This is the main question today. In this sense, every week, literally every day, we feel more and more stable. At the beginning of the program I said that it was not possible for anyone to turn back the privatization of small enterprises, even for the 'Smena' faction, no matter how much it is striving for this.

"As for the privatization of major enterprises, according to our assessments, I think, it will take approximately a month, maximum a month and a half, for this process, not only in Volgograd and a dozen other cities but in Russia as a whole, to become part of people's everyday life. Then nobody could turn it back."

As for their role in the forthcoming referendum, Chubays says: "Everything we are doing in the framework of privatization is central to the economic policy of President Yeltsin. It was planned from the very beginning. It was criticized. It was spat upon, almost destroyed by deputies in most various forms. But nevertheless, life has accepted it and people have accepted it. And if the people, proceeding from this, will give their votes to the President, I am convinced, they will make the right decision."

In conclusion, asked about the future of the privatization, Chubays says: "Everything depends very much on the political situation. This is indeed the case. It depends on the referendum, which Andranik has mentioned. It depends on what decision the Supreme Soviet will take today. And to what length they will go in their efforts to stop privatization. What they will dare to do and whether they will have enough common sense. It is very difficult to give a somewhat firm assessment of the situation."

Lyubimov thanks Migranyan and asks whether he thinks the privatization process could be stopped. Migranyan agrees with Chubays that it could not. Of course there are many difficulties ahead, he says, but people would be able to benefit from it in the long run.

Minister Glazyev Criticizes Central Bank Export Policy

MK0304093093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 9

[Konstantin Smirnov report: "Sergey Glazyev's Press Conference. Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations Against Higher Quota of Hard-Currency Sales]

[Text] Following his address at the Council of Ministers Presidium meeting on 31 March, (KOMMERSANT-DAILY wrote about this address in its previous issue) Foreign Economic Relations Minister Sergey Glazyev made public the key proposals of his ministry in support of export, during a news briefing at the Foreign Ministry press center yesterday. According to KOMMERSANT-DAILY experts, of special interest is the minister's stance on currency regulation.

Russian Industrial Export

Assessing the situation relating to the export of finished products, Sergey Glazyev identified three main elements. First, the mechanism of payment relations with traditional consumers of Russian machinery and technology exports has disintegrated. According to the minister, 73 percent of machinery and technology exports in the past was accounted for by East European countries, India, Turkey, and China. The switch to settlements in hard currency with these countries is largely to blame for the general precipitous decline in Russian industrial exports. Second, the centralized system for export financing was broken up, and nothing has been created to replace it. With the aim of supporting exporters, it is proposed to create soon a Russian export-import bank that will enable the opening of permanent credit lines to Russian exporters via state-guaranteed long-term credits. Third, it was noted at the press conference that many Russian exporters are not ready for work on external markets. This problem can be overcome, Mr. Glazyev thinks, by public cross-corporatization of the producers and specialized exporters.

Currency Regulation

Mr. Glazyev thinks that it is impossible to stabilize the export of Russian finished products, still less appreciably to expand them, without putting hard-currency settlements in order and coordinating monetary policy between the government and the Central Bank. According to the minister, it is intolerable when, through the Russian Bank's fault, there is a two- or three-month delay in crediting to the exporters' accounts the rubles to cover the 30 percent of their export proceeds in hard currency that are bought by the bank. The minister estimates that exporter enterprises carry the burden of a concealed 20-percent export tax in conditions of inflation that is running at 20 to 30 percent a month. According to Mr. Glazyev, unless the Central Bank installs order in the procedure of crediting rubles to exporters' accounts, the Ministry of Foreign Economic

Relations will press for altering the mechanism of mandatory sales of export proceeds in hard currency so that the entire 50 percent of hard-currency revenue should be sold on the internal hard-currency market with no mandatory quota to be sold to the Central Bank. The minister opposed increasing the 50-percent fixed quota of hard currency subject to mandatory sale.

Glazyev Cited on Draft Program for Industrial Exports

PM0504140993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Mikhail Berger article: "Russian Exporters To Get State Support"]

[Text] Russia's Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations has submitted to the government a draft state program for stimulating Russia's industrial exports in the next three years.

This is in practice the first "program" document from the current minister Sergey Glazyev, and it provides some definite views of the foreign trade department's foreign economic strategy. The program's three aims, apart from developing exports of machinery and technology and enhancing export efficiency, is to increase the state's regulatory and stimulatory role in developing industrial exports.

The program's main provisions were put forward by the minister at a press conference. In particular, he noted that the overall economic conditions for supporting industrial exports last year were inadequate. The lifting of compulsory sales of foreign exchange earnings and the payment of duties failed to provide a stimulus for exports of machinery and technology. Admittedly, the minister noted, there were external causes for this phenomenon too. One of these was Russian goods' restricted access to the main markets. The United States is still applying against Russia the regulatory rules that were intended for trade relations with centralized state trade. This means that a violation of the rules by any Russian firm—including a private firm—would incur sanctions against all exporters in the relevant sphere of activity.

But Glazyev said that the main reason for the drop in exports was the fundamental change in the geopolitical situation, the elimination of artificial systems of settlement in the former CEMA and in trade with India and certain other countries, and the refusal to supply goods to insolvent purchasers. All this geopolitics, in his words, accounts for 73 percent of the total drop in exports.

All these circumstances, the minister said, have led to a need to set up a specialized export support program.

The program envisages the creation of a system to provide credit and insurance for exports, and the restoration of a system of state credits for export projects—particularly in the investment sphere. It is also planned to create conditions for the more active utilization of the national soft currencies of Russia's partners, the development of transport infrastructure and information backup, and, of course, the creation of an interdepartmental commission to stimulate industrial exports (already done).

The priorities include the creation of a Russian Export-Import Bank and a Russian Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The minister paid particular attention to the problem of arms exports. Russia is being pushed out of this important market. While Russian military exports have fallen, the United States has doubled its exports of military hardware. The ousting of Russia from the world arms market is leading to the loss of potentially massive foreign currency resources which, in the minister's opinion, are impossible to offset with any foreign aid or credits.

Implementation of the program, in the minister's opinion, presupposes that in strategic terms—by the end of the decade—exports of machinery and technology will have increased to $15 billion a year.

It is hard to say whether these plans will bear fruit or not, but it is already obvious that Sergey Glazyev is consistently implementing his tendency to increase the state's regulatory role in foreign economic activity.

Military & Space Issues

Meeting Views Problems of Counterintelligence

LD0504221793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By correspondent Leonid Lukyanov; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Now some news from the central apparatus of the Security Ministry. Minister Barannikov has held a meeting with the staff of the Academy of the Ministry. At present the Academy is engaged in training various cadres, including border guards and members of counterintelligence.

[Lukyanov] It was pointed out at the meeting that intelligence work against Russia has recently been stepped up, using legal fronts and diplomatic cover and operating from the former USSR republics. It takes at least four to five years to train a member of counterintelligence to work in the new conditions. Therefore, it is very important now to turn to the experience of professionals who have remained true to the interests of the defense of the state and of the renewed Russia.

It was also mentioned here that the ministry has had no budget for two years, that no money has been allocated for a nationwide program for fighting organized crime, and that a law on state secrets has not been adopted.

The ministry has prepared a blueprint for counterintelligence work which is being examined at present. In this situation, the role of the Academy's scientists and teachers in training and retraining cadres and in scientific study of problems is very important.

Cosmos-2240 Satellite Launched 2 Apr

LD0304061293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0530 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 3 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—The latest artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2240, was launched aboard a Soyuz booster rocket from the Plesetsk range on 2 April, the Flight Control Center announced today.

The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

It has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution 89.6 mins; maximum distance from the Earth's surface (apogee) 342 km; minimum distance from the Earth's surface (perigee) 196 km; orbital inclination 62.8 degrees.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetry system for transmitting to Earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The equipment aboard the satellite is functioning normally.

Supreme Soviet

Parliamentarian Suggests Postponing START II Hearings

OW0504170093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1619 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chairman of Russia's Parliamentary Committee on Defense and Security Issues Sergey Stepashin thinks it wise to discontinue further parliamentary hearings on the ratification of the Russo-American START II treaty signed in Moscow on January, 3 1993 until the April 25 referendum. In an interview given to "Interfax" S. Stepashin underlined that, bearing in mind the situation that resulted from the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies, one may suggest that renewing the hearings might awaken political forces that oppose the ratification of the Treaty and may want to use it for propaganda purposes during the preparation for the referendum.

Prior to renewing the parliamentary hearings on the issue, said Stepashin, a series of consultations between the Russian parliamentarians and their colleagues from the U.S. Congress has to be conducted. These meetings, previously scheduled for April, clearly cannot take place earlier than May, stressed S. Stepashin.

New First Deputy Chairman Voronin Profiled

PM0504111593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 93 First Edition p 4

[Article by Sergey Chugayev: "New First Deputy Speaker"]

[Text] The appointment of Yuriy Voronin, deputy chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, to the second post in the soviets' hierarchy signifies the latest and perhaps the last stage in the evolution of the parliament and congress. Until the actual start of the work of the ninth congress of people's deputies the majority of observers predicted N. Ryabov for the post of first deputy parliament speaker. The outward political amorphousness of the former speaker of the Soviet of Republics and now deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet told in favor of this speculation. The election to the post of first deputy of Yu. Voronin, who comes from the communist factions was, the experts believed, not in the interests of the supporters of the communist idea who now dominate parliament and the congress, since it would be logical for them to retain the Supreme Soviet's image as a democratic and entirely pluralistic organ of power.

But it looks as though R. Khasbulatov's attempt to reach a compromise with the president at the congress convinced the true leaders of the supreme legislative organ that in the present political situation they could not take a risk and gamble on those figures of whom, despite their repeatedly demonstrated loyalty, they were not 100 percent confident. R. Khasbulatov was punished as an example and the chair of first deputy speaker was given, contrary to expectations, not to N. Ryabov but to Yu. Voronin.

Thus it was logical to conclude that the leaders of parliament's communist majority no longer consider it necessary to conceal, as they did after August 1991, their views and intentions under a pseudodemocratic camouflage. And that means that the struggle for political and economic transformations in Russia is into the finishing straight.

Yu. Voronin is a typical representative of the party and economic nomenklatura which today determines the policy of parliament and the congress. He was born in 1939 and graduated from the Kazan aviation institute. He made his party and economic career in Tatarstan. In party work he rose to the post of secretary of the Tatar CPSU Oblast Committee responsible for industry. In economic work he achieved the post of chairman of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic's State Planning Committee.

Having become a member of the Russian Supreme Soviet, he chose economics as his sphere of activity. Political storms did not impede Yu. Voronin's success and parliamentary career. He quite soon became chairman of the commission for the budget, plans, taxes, and prices, and then, as someone who came from the

communist factions—an alternative to democrat S. Filatov—he was elected deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

In contrast to many of his legislator colleagues Yu. Voronin has never changed his political views. He belongs to the "Communists of Russia" faction and after August 1991 became a member of the Socialist Party of Working People, whose rules allow parallel membership of the CPSU.

Recently, during parliament session sittings we have frequently heard demands from deputies that R. Khasbulatov relinquish the post of chair to Yu. Voronin. When the parliament sessions are chaired by Yu. Voronin, as a rule there are no rowdy scenes or misunderstandings. The new first vice speaker is distinguished by his ability to implement the necessary decisions in such a way that his opponents do not feel insulted or diminished. As chair Yu. Voronin is resolute and precise and does not allow himself to go beyond the framework of universally accepted rules.

Yu. Voronin's new appointment, considering the support of the political forces which nominated him, turns him into a figure who almost surpasses R. Khasbulatov in terms of influence. As is well known, the entire enormous apparatus of the Supreme Soviet is subordinate to the first deputy speaker, and all threads of management of the life of parliament which proceeds outside the framework of open session sittings converge in him. According to comments from people who have worked with Yu. Voronin he is a very tough leader, values discipline and loyalty, and does not forgive manifestations of disloyalty and differences of opinion. Many deputies believe that in the very near future these qualities of the new first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet will be markedly reflected in the life of the Russian House of Soviets.

Voronin Grants Interview

LD0404132193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1840 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Interview with Yuriy Mikhailovich Voronin, first deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given; from the "Russian Supreme Soviet Report" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Voronin] In our life today, I think, greater emphasis is placed on the political aspect, which I regard as being a grave shortcoming. You will note that the president made a speech and the prime minister did likewise, right after he had been confirmed, both appealing to the deputies and to the people proposing that 1993 should be made a year of work on the economy and that a moratorium should be declared on all elections at all levels, so that the people might really direct all its main efforts toward stabilizing the economy and bringing Russia out of crisis. And yet today, having at the Eighth Congress abrogated the holding of referendums and limiting local elections, we are again going in the same direction. In that respect, therefore, I think that the Congress and the president have, in my view, not thought through clearly enough the policy to be pursued in 1993, and for the moment have failed to find the agreement which would make it possible to resolve the main task, that of bringing Russia out of crisis.

If you and I were to examine the situation in the socioeconomic sphere, then we would see that it is not improving. The results, at least for January-February—the figures for the first quarter have not come in yet—testify to the fact that the fall in production is continuing: Over those two months it already stands at 20 percent.

[Correspondent] But what, after all, is the way out of this situation? How does the Supreme Soviet think the country can be brought out of this socioeconomic crisis? The branches of power are unable to reach an agreement on policy, while the economy is indeed suffering. There was a decision on setting up a coalition. How far is this possible? Why not let the government get working on this? Is something going wrong here? What really is going on here?

[Voronin] Well, as an ordinary citizen of the Russian Federation, I would like to put a question to you. Do you know what socioeconomic policy has been pursued for the last 18 months or two years? You would have to, in order to support that policy and take an active part in implementing it.

We still do not have a clear state economic policy. A mighty state like Russia still does not have an approved program. After all, no one disputes the fact that we would choose the transition to market relations as one of the most important means of increasing production efficiency. No one disputes that now. But what is the general line? Where are we going? I think that if you were to ask the population this question, it is unlikely that anyone could answer it.

I think this is the first serious mistake which—let us be frank—is charateristic of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress, and the government, too. But, whether we like it or not, the logic behind preparing and implementing this socioeconomic line, the impetus, should come from the government. And this social and economic logic, the social and economic orientation should have a corresponding legal basis. If there is no basis, then one has to ask what on earth is the Supreme Soviet doing and how efficient is it?

Therefore, whether we like it or not, any government—whether it is this one or one enjoying the confidence of the people—must, first and foremost, work out a clear long term program, in other words, a strategic program from which we can also develop a program of anticrisis measures. An anticrisis program is an integral part of the strategic course which both the government and the Supreme Soviet must implement together.

[Correspondent] But what we have is lack of cohesion between the upper echelons of power. The president issues decrees which are vetoed and all sent off to the Constitutional Court. So this lack of balance means that the economy suffers. Is there a solution to this situation? Perhaps the referendum which has been announced? Let the people decide at the end of the day?

[Voronin] I think that the referendum will, to a certain extent, affect both the political and socioeconomic course. It is thought that the referendum may produce some sort of result. But what will the result be? This raises a whole host of questions right away.

When Boris Yeltsin was running for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman, still at the first Congress, he said in his speech that in his view it was necessary to hold a referendum which would enable the Russian population to answer fundamental questions which could subsequently be used as a basis for a new constitution. And at that time this was a correct way of looking at the matter. This means that basically the question was about what kind of state we wish to build and in which direction should Russia move? All of these questions have been dealt with in the current constitution. The presidency is mentioned, private land ownership is also mentioned in the Constitution, and the Federative Treaty forms a constituent part of the Constitution, and so on.

Therefore, when the heads of administration had gathered—and this is a newly created body under the leadership of the president—then more or less all the heads of republics within the Russian Federation unanimously declared that there should be no referendum on these questions. This is why the Eighth Congress cancelled the holding of the referendum.

Then Boris Nikolayevich made another speech in which he spoke again about the need to hold a referendum on trust. So the Ninth Congress approved it. And so on 25 April there will be a referendum.

[Correspondent] Why do you think that the adoption of a new Constitution would impede, rather than...

[Voronin, interrupting] No, I don't. No, I don't think...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Why not include the question of the new constitution in the referendum questions?

[Voronin] No, I don't think that, but the point is that if we include questions related to the new constitution—they have indeed been worked out by the Constitutional Commission—but we saw the reaction to these questions. In fact, they did not bring any new elements, and it would not have been expedient to hold a referendum solely for this. Moreover, let me tell you that the public supports the view that perhaps we should work on the basis of the old Constitution for now, the current Constitution, to be more precise.

It seems to me that the question is not whether this is a new Constitution or the newest, but that it must be respected.

[Correspondent] Let us try to make some forecasts: What if? What will happen if the president loses? What will happen if people's representatives lose, that is, if people vote for early elections of a Congress? Well, all right, let us say that this is not really important, a new congress can be elected, but what will happen if the president loses?

[Voronin] The president has stated in no uncertain terms several results which could arise after this referendum is held. In particular, he does not reject that if there is no confidence in the president, then he will resign and there will an election for a new president within three months. The present social and economic situation, and probably the political one as well, has meant that the greater part of the people, unfortunately, has become very apathetic. And here there is anger that the referendum may not come about for this very reason.

I think that if we want to see the rebirth of Russia, we nevertheless have to do everything so that the referendum takes place. Because, for me personally as an economist, the answer to the second question is important, to say the least: To what extent is the population satisified with the social and economic policies being pursued by—I won't say the president—by the government since 1992. This question is, for me, crystal clear. But if we want to find out the opinion of the people, I think that this opinion will play a very large role in developing a new state economic policy.

[Correspondent] What if there is not the 50 percent? What will happen then?

[Voronin] Well then, if they don't turn out, then the referendum will not take place.

[Correspondent] So then back to the same deadlock situation that we're in.

[Voronin] Why deadlock? I think a specific approach will be worked out, including, as you correctly noted, through the calling of an extraordinary Congress. There is nothing wrong with this. You know that very often it is said that the Congress has become obsolete. The Congress is not the sort of forum which we need today—we need to move to a bicameral parliament. The question is not about how many people—people's deputies—will be elected to the Congress but about the questions which it has to tackle.

Perhaps we need to review the situation and make the relevant corrections so that the Congress, too, carries out a sufficiently specific, but at the same time, broad (?role) from the point of view of political and socioeconomic issues, in the development of Russia.

[Correspondent] So, why the Congress after all but not a two-chamber parliament?

[Voronin] It may well be a bicameral parliament, but we should not destroy everything all at once. We are used to breaking things first and then admitting to the wrong. Let us conduct the referendum, obtain results—even if the population does not come to vote, I believe one should not make a drama out of this.

[Correspondent] Now, a question on the mass media: This unfortunate resolution of the Congress has stirred up and confused everybody to a great extent, and a huge wave is rising up in press and television: New censorship is being introduced. What can we do? How shall we live? Supervisory councils have been set up.

[Voronin] Let us say frankly that a considerable part of the airtime on television and a considerable number of newspapers and magazines do not objectively reflect today's political and socioeconomic situation, at the end of the day. More than that, there is a graphic, in a way, confrontation and even ostentatious attention to negative anti-Supreme Soviet aspects.

Let me reiterate: Life will not develop properly unless we present in a weighted way all the opinions existing in society. As for the Supervisory Council: In many civilized countries there are similar supervisory councils, on televisions as well. This does not signify however that censorship should be introduced. I have always been against interfering, to put it crudely, in the mass media, against bulldozing them, so to speak. But, let me repeat, supervisory councils exist in many countries. Especially if television belongs to the state. Today many mass media, which are administered directly by the government, are pursuing a wrong line.

[Correspondent] But the government and the president have not set up any supervisory councils.

[Voronin] Indeed. However, whether we want it or not, I believe that being administered by the government financially and, let us say, in other ways, most airtime is allocated to progovernment structures which unfortunately don't always give an objective representation of the reality.

[Correspondent] Thank you.

[Voronin] Any other questions?

[Correspondent] No, thank you.

'Machinations' on Referendum Vote Counting Viewed

PM0504152193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandra Lugovskaya: "Parliament's Voting Down of Amendments to the Referendum Law Could Affect Constitutional Court's Decision"]

[Text] The discussion of the draft law "On introducing changes and additions to the law 'On RSFSR referendums'" at the 1 April sitting of the Russian parliament prompted a fierce debate.

The deputies were asked to legalize the vote counting system approved by the Congress decree, which extends the principle of a constitutional majority (50 percent plus one vote) to all four questions submitted for the referendum. Including the first two: "Do you have confidence in Russian Federation President B.N. Yeltsin? Do you approve the socioeconomic policy implemented by the Russian Federation president and Russian Federation government since 1992?"

In order to understand the essence of parliament's machinations, you have to get to grips with the existing norm of Article 35 of the Referendum Law, which says that when a referendum is being held on questions of the adoption, amendment, or amplification of the Constitution, decisions are deemed to have been adopted if more than half of the citizens on the roll for participation in the referendum voted for them, but decisions on nonconstitutional questions are adopted if more than half of those participating in the vote rather than of those on the roll vote for them.

Since the questions about confidence in the president and approval of his socioeconomic policy cannot by any stretch of the imagination be counted as "changes or additions to the Constitution," the Supreme Soviet chose different tactics, which were to introduce an amendment whereby the "same procedure for establishing the results of the vote can be established by the Congress of People's Deputies when it adopts decisions on setting the referendum date and on other matters."

It is appropriate to point out that the Ninth Congress had already adopted the "same procedure for establishing the results of the voting" on the first two "presidential" questions in its timely decree, and the Supreme Soviet members had only to confirm it as a legal norm by introducing an amendment to the Referendum Law. And, in this way, grant all subsequent congresses the right to set their own quotas for decision-making. For instance, depending on the political situation, in violation of a legal norm, as happened at the last congress.

Before the individual vote, Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman N. Ryabov explained to parliament that this norm, irrespective of how many votes the president obtains, "has no legal consequences for him," and he will be entitled to decide on his own future actions. The deputy speaker was hinting at the president's declared intention to resign if he fails to get enough votes.

Nonetheless, the draft law was voted down, despite Yu. Voronin's proposal that it be basically adopted on first reading and approved later.

What is the reason for parliament's haste in examining the draft law "On Making Changes and Additions to the Law 'On RSFSR Referendums'"? Obviously it was due

to the fact that in his letter to the Constitutional Court President B. Yeltsin regarded the norm for counting the votes as unconstitutional and was preparing a petition in this connection. But it was the adoption of the proposed amendments that could have provided grounds for the Constitutional Court to turn down the president's petition.

By attempting to introduce into the law Congress' right to change the procedure for the adoption of very important decisions to conform with the political situation, the parliamentary leadership once again demonstrated its claim to absolute power. A claim that nothing can subdue, not even laws, which, according to the well established tradition, deputies are tirelessly amending to suit themselves.

Presidium Reportedly To Set Up Bodyguard Department

PM0204134393 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 1

[O. Gerasimenko report: "King's Musketeers and Cardinal's Guards?"]

[Text] The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial office has learned that the first post-Congress Supreme Soviet Presidium session, behind tightly closed doors, was devoted to discussing the draft "Statute on the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Department of Protection." It is planned to form special subunits under the parliament with the status of a federal organ of state protection—in order to ensure the personal security of the Supreme Soviet chairman, his deputies, the members of the Presidium, the chairmen of the chambers, people's deputies, and other persons in accordance with a list defined by the Supreme Soviet.

The new document fits neatly into the specific system of relations between the leaders of the two branches of power. Even the most politically unsophisticated observer will scarcely view its appearance in the wake of the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies as an accident. The first attempt to form "Khasbulatov's guards" dates back to November of last year. With a single stroke of the pen, the speaker, who at that time was not yet so obstreperous, ordered into existence his own special subunit inside the "White House." However, Khasbulatov's noble attempts to protect himself and at the same time parliamentarians with a personally dedicated militia were unsuccessful. Presidential directive No 630 "On Disbanding Illegal Armed Formations" swiftly emerged.

All the indications are that parliament gained its second wind from Boris Yeltsin's decision to reorganize the special Kremlin regiment on the eve of the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies as a special presidential regiment and at the same time by the secret restriction of deputies' access to the territory of the president's residence in the Kremlin.

However, everything indicates that the president's regiment will look like a mere company of irregulars next to the speaker's new department. In terms of both numbers and technical equipment, and proposed powers. The new department is to perform not only protection functions, but also tasks to identify and preemptively suppress sources of "threats to the vital interests" of the structures and leaders of the Supreme Soviet. Who can guarantee that the president's regiment will not shortly prove to be such a target?

Supreme Soviet Passes Agriculture Bills 2 Apr

LD0204164593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1400 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By Mariya Vasilyeva; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Starting tomorrow, the deputies of the Supreme Soviet disperse to their constituencies. For the next week and a half they will have meetings with the electorate. That is probably why today's session, which was the last session of the chambers before the break, was very intensive.

Five laws were passed, including a law on grain that regulates relations between the state and those who produce grain. In particular, in accordance with this law the state undertakes to repay half the cost of harvesting combines and half of the expenditure on processing and storing grain, and it establishes at the start of each year the bottom guaranteed level of purchase prices taking account of the price on the world market. A state grain inspectorate will be set up under the government whose task will be to check the quality and rational use of grain.

Today, the parliament also introduced changes and additions to the law on medical insurance. This document was returned by the president for re-examination. The parliament passed the president's amendments aimed at raising the government's responsibility in setting up insurance funds. An article has also been introduced into the law in accordance with which public associations of invalids are freed from paying dues for compulsory medical insurance.

Nationalities Soviet Discusses Crime Fight Bill

PM0204150793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Linkov report under general heading "There Should Be No Haste in Adopting Laws": "Soviet of Nationalities"]

[Text] The debate at the 31 March evening session of the Soviet of Nationalities on the creation of a Russian Federation Investigations Committee under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Soviet was no less acute. The idea of those who worked on the draft is that the pooling of efforts will provide greater scope for investigators' work, ensure their independence, and provide other guarantees.

Summing up the results of the debates, B. Kondrashov, deputy chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legality, Law and Order, and the Fight Against Crime, who submitted the bill, noted that the drafting team had not rushed things or pushed ahead, cognizant of the difficulties of the current period. And they have not insisted on its immediate adoption, which could wait for a year or two.

But in no way can the problem be swept under the carpet. Only 67 percent of investigators with higher education are left. Almost 1.5 million crimes have gone unsolved in the past year. If people want the situation to get even worse, then they can postpone the proposed draft.

The Soviet of the Republic [as published] also examined and adopted without discussion the bill "On Changes and Amendments to the RSFSR Code of Criminal Procedure and the RSFSR Code of Civil Procedure on the Procedure for Examining Cases Relating to State Secrets."

Regional Affairs

Yeltsin Meets Supporters During Brief Stopover in Bratsk

LD0504165693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1624 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Khody]

[Text] Irkutsk April 5 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin who on the way from Vancouver to Moscow made a stopover in Bratsk, left for the Russian capital tonight.

The president's short stay in Bratsk was passing in the atmosphere of sincere cordiality. At the airport Boris Yeltsin was met by residents of this Siberian city carrying tricolors and posters saying "We Are With You!", "Presidential Republic to Russia" and " The Will of the People is the Supreme Law of the State".

The same warm atmosphere was during the president's visit to the Bratsk aluminum plant. The main topic of his talks with the people who were waiting for him there, was the forthcoming referendum. "I propose a simple formula of voting: to answer 'yes' to all the four questions," the president told workers around him. "Do not be afraid to say 'yes' also to the question about re-electing the president," Boris Yeltsin pointed out.

The president is convinced he will be re-elected to the supreme state post as there is no alternative to him. "Tomorrow or the day after tomorrow this alternative may appear, but now the situation is exactly like this," the head of state stressed.

Speaking on his talks with the leaders of the United States and Canada, the president noted that a large-scale programme of Russia's cooperation with these countries had been worked out. For instance, in the course of his talks with President Bill Clinton, over fifty issues dealing with various aspects of relations between the two states were settled or advanced. Boris Yeltsin said specifically that credits to be granted by the United States will be used to support medium-scale and small businesses in Siberia and in the far east.

Incidentally, as it turned out even such industrial giants as the Bratsk aluminum plant, which became a joint-stock company at the end of 1992, also needs credits. For many years this plant has produced mainly raw aluminum and wire rods made from it. Only at present the Bratsk aluminum plant has begun to manufacture consumer goods, including heating appliances, plates and dishes and furniture. Boris Yeltsin familiarized himself with one of such shops producing knitted goods.

At the same time this plant and the city on the whole has a lot of other problems, one of them being shortage of funds for individual house building. "We need credits to be repaid by installments for several years, we will not survive without them," workers of the plant complained. Bratsk residents also handed in to the president an application for the recognition of Bratsk a city of ecological disaster as its enterprises are located in dangerous proximity to residential areas. For this reason the best cadres are leaving the city. Since last year the total population of Bratsk has begun to go down. The president promised to help in the settlement of these problems.

Before his flight to Moscow, Boris Yeltsin visited the Kirpishchikovs' family who were his fellow students at the institute he had graduated.

Comments on Summit

LD0504194993 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By unidentified announcer on President Boris Yeltsin's arrival in Bratsk, including recording of Yeltsin remarks; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Excerpt] In about two hours the aircraft of the Russian president will land in Moscow. En route Boris Yeltsin stopped over in eastern Siberia.

Returning from Canada to Moscow, President Yeltsin briefly stopped over in Bratsk, a typical Siberian town with 300,000 people. Near the aircraft steps he was met by representatives of Irkutsk Oblast and city leaders. Here too, he gave a brief interview to our program. In reply to a question about what he will remember his meeting with Bill Clinton for, Boris Yeltsin said:

[Yeltsin] We covered 52 issues. Most of them have been either resolved or almost resolved. The main proportion of the aid which they will give us in order to support reforms in Russia will be mainly channelled precisely into the Siberian area and the Far East. The program proposed by Clinton is very detailed. It has a month-by-month schedule. It details spheres into which aid is to be injected and earmarks specific amounts of money for each industry and area. So, it

will be possible to control things well. That is very important, you see. [passage omitted]

Further on Yeltsin Stopover in Magadan

OW0504132093 Vladivostok Radiostantsiya Tikhiy Okean Maritime Network in Russian 0715 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Report by Gennadiy Ovchinnikov from Magadan; from the "Pacific Ocean" program]

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin stopped in Magadan on his way to Canada. The oblast center has met the president with a bright sun and a spring heat unusual for this month. It was the first time this year the thermometer rose above zero. In short, the president has brought spring to the residents of Magadan as well as hopes for a change for the better, which is only too natural for this time of the year.

All eight hours of the president's visit were reserved minute by minute, and preference was given to solving the current problems of the region. Viktor Mikhaylov, head of the oblast administration, and Sergey Petrishchev, presidential representative in the oblast, began briefing Boris Yeltsin on the spectrum of local problems while they were still in the car on the way from the airport to the city. I will speak later on what has been solved, but first a few words on what the president said during his meetings with the Magadan residents, what questions he was asked—in short, everything we journalists managed to uncover through both official and unofficial sources of information.

While visiting the Magadan fish processing factory, Boris Yeltsin stated that he considers congress' decision on the procedure for calculating the results of the upcoming referendum a violation of the law, and would view the results of the voting in accordance with a principle outlined in the law on referendums which was already utilized during the first presidential elections—namely, the majority would be calculated according to the number of people who came to the polling stations, and not according to the lists of voters registered in the districts.

During a private dinner at the oblast administration, Yeltsin stated for the first time that if he did not receive approval of his activities as president, he would resign immediately. Kozyrev, the minister of foreign affairs, asked him who would govern the country until the elections, and the president grimly joked: Maybe Kozyrev.

When speaking at the Magadan Border Guards Unit, Boris Yeltsin touched upon the problems of the neutral portion of the Sea of Okhotsk. He said: Kozyrev maintains that this problem cannot be solved through diplomatic channels. Boris Yeltsin further stated that considering countries such as the United States, Japan, and Canada take no part in the devastation of Alaskan pollock in the Sea of Okhotsk and exhibit an understanding of our problem, we will find other nondiplomatic ways which will force China, Korea, Poland, and Ukraine to respect our position on this problem. When asked to specify what measures these will be, the president joked again, saying: Do not press me, just wait a bit.

The president delivered two short speeches to the residents of Magadan on 3 April. The first was during an unexpected stop at the trade center. Having examined goods and prices in the supermarket, Boris Yeltsin was first surprised by prices that were low compared with neighboring regions. Butter is sold in Magadan for 800 rubles a kilogram, freshly frozen fish for 150 rubles, boiled salami for 600 rubles, beef for 500 rubles, and white bread for 35 rubles. However, the president later remarked that even this did not compensate for the losses incurred by northerners because of the climatic conditions they have to live in.

The second time Yeltsin spoke at an improvised rally as he left the building of the oblast administration. The president took a loudspeaker and thanked the Magadan residents for their warm reception and kind smiles which he had not seen for a long time in Moscow, a city which boils with political passion.

And now, my promise to tell what the local administration managed to get out of the president. First—and this might be considered the main success—the willingness of the president to allocate 2.5 tonnes of gold from state reserves as an investment in the reconstruction and development of the two main gold and silver deposits in the oblast—namely (?Kubaki) and (?Dukavskoye). In exchange, Magadan promises to increase gold production from 29 tonnes to 40 tonnes, and silver production from 180 to 500 tonnes within a period of three years. Initially this gold was supposed to be deposited into one of the foreign banks as a guarantee for a credit of $30 million. However, when it became clear that processing this transaction would take almost a year, it was decided to sell this gold inside Russia and invest the profit in the gold- producing industry of Magadan Oblast. Viktor Mikhaylov, head of the oblast administration, said: Even if only this problem has been solved as a result of the visit, we would have been satisfied.

The residents of Magadan were very glad to hear the president's statement that he would do everything he could so that the U.S.-Canadian aid promised by Clinton and Mulroney would not be sucked up like water on sand by Moscow's ministries and departments. The president said: I will do everything to prevent this aid from crossing the Ural Mountains so that it will be used entirely by Siberians and residents of the Far East.

I deem as very significant the president's decision to create in Nakhodka a special temporary governmental group at the deputy minister level to discuss Arctic navigation. The group would coordinate the bringing of cargoes to the furthermost regions of the north between

May to October. The local administration also succeeded in convincing the president to limit entry into the region by residents of the northern Caucasus and Central Asia, who mainly deal in gold acquisition. In all probability we will have residency permits such as in Moscow. In short, under the guise of fighting crime, Magadan will again become a closed city, a proposal which the local populace welcomes most warmly.

During long talks with the president, local leaders managed to solve many other oblast problems. The main thing now is turning the general agreements into concrete presidential edicts and governmental decrees. A special group of oblast administration specialists was created to this end. It left for Moscow at once to collect all the necessary permits and documents for these projects from the corridors of power in Moscow. It is well known that all good initiatives and promises of the president are destroyed in these bureaucratic corridors. Nevertheless, Magadan residents intend to ram these documents through before 25 April at the latest—that is, before the referendum. After this there is no telling if all this can ever come true.

Mordovian Supreme Soviet Abolishes Post of President

LD0404141393 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 4 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Today we received a report from Saransk. Mordovia has become the first republic of the Russian Federation to abolish the post of president.

[Unidentified correspondent] Yesterday, 3 April, at the 14th session of Mordovia's Supreme Soviet, the post of the republic's president was abolished by a two-thirds majority vote. Deputies voted in a roll-call. In this connection, at the next session, to be held on Wednesday 7 April, deputies are to discuss amendments to the Constitution. Another topic that will probably be discussed is for how long Vasiliy Dmitrievich Guslyannikov will carry out the duties of Mordovia's president. Or maybe the question will be put to a republic-wide referendum, to be held parallel with the all-Russian one, on 25 April.

The session in general is proceeding in a normal atmosphere, except for a rally in the square in front of the House of Soviets on the first day of its work.

[Announcer] We have learned that the session was attended by a famous campaigner against the presidency in Russia, [Russian Federation People's] Deputy Vladimir Isakov.

Called 'A Constitutional Coup'

LD0504133593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Preparations for the 25 April referendum were discussed in Moscow today by the public committee of Russia's democratic organizations. A memorandum, which has been circulated, notes that political reforms in the country must be based on recognition and protection of human and civil rights and freedoms. Only if the work of the president, the government, and the democratic public in Russia is consistent and coordinated can the reforms be made irreversible and successful, the document notes.

An attempt to remove the popularly elected president of the Mordovian Republic from power was also included as an urgent item on the agenda. Mordovian Vice President Vladimir Narezhnyy told me about the events in Saransk.

[Begin Narezhnyy recording] In effect, a constitutional coup has taken place. The conservative-dominated parliament has passed what presently amounts to a political decision to abolish the presidency as an institution. But on Wednesday it will attempt to pass legislative acts, a law amending the Constitution. This would put a juridical seal on this question. But there have been many breaches of the Russian Federation Constitution and the Constitution of the Mordovian Soviet Socialist Republic, as well as regulations affecting the government's work. [end recording]

Vice President Comments

LD0504193993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1746 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yuriy Vdovin]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—By abolishing the institution of president, the Mordovian Parliament actually staged a constitutional coup, Vladimir Narezhny, vice-president of Mordovia, told a news conference here on Monday [5 April].

"This emotional decision to remove President Vasily Guslyannikov, who was elected by the whole people, was adopted at a session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic by the majority of deputies—former partapparatchiks [as received]," the vice-president said.

Vladimir Narezhny believes that "this is an attempt to return to the past." According to the vice-president, this, in many respects, depended on "actions by destructive forces" among which he named deputies of the Russian Federation Sergey Baburin and Vladimir Isakov who visited Mordovia and spoke at a parliament session.

The vice-president noted that the president's team "will act only by constitutional methods and in accordance with the law." Vladimir Narezhny believes that an objective assessment of what has happened should be done by the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation where a corresponding appeal has been sent.

Dagestan Official Survives Assassination Attempt

LD0404073793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0640 GMT 4 Apr 93

[By CRIME-PRESS correspondent Gadzhiy Shamov]

[Text] Makhachkala, 3 Apr—There has been an attempt to assassinate Said Amirov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Dagestan. On the night of 2 April the Volga limousine in which Amirov was returning home from work was fired upon by criminals using automatic weapons. He and his driver were wounded, but their lives are not in danger. The attackers got away.

The Interior Ministry is viewing the incident as an act of terrorism and a criminal investigation is under way.

This is the second attempt on Said Amirov's life. The first took place exactly one year ago.

Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet Adds to Referendum

LD0404130393 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 4 Apr 93

[By Gafurov; from the "Novosti" program]

[Text] A session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Bashkortostan finished in Ufa. During four days, the Supreme Soviet considered over 40 questions and adopted appropriate documents. It adopted a resolution, in particular, on holding the referendum on 25 April on the questions stated by the Russian Congress of People's Deputies. An additional question is also being put for the referendum: Do you believe that the Republic of Bashkortostan must have economic independence and a treaty with the Russian Federation, based on the Federation Treaty, and an addition to it made on behalf of the Republic of Bashkortostan?

Bashkortostan Parliament Head Worried by Political Crisis

OW0204203993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1636 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via ' 'ODO]

[Text] Murtaza Rakhimov, Chairman of the Bashkortostan Supreme Soviet, thinks that the central authorities have been weakened to such an extent that they have lost control of the situation. Speaking at the Thursday [1 April] session of the parliament in Ufa he made it clear that now the Supreme Soviet and government of the republic bear full responsibility for what is going on in Bashkortostan. "The logic itself of events has confirmed that our course towards political and economic self-sufficiency is correct," Rakhimov said.

On the same day he told TV viewers in the republic that the Federative Agreement which provided for unity of Russia and was signed a year ago has not been implemented, to his regret. Rakhimov complained that the Constitutional Commission of Russia neglected that document which, he thinks, must be integrated in Russia's new Constitution.

The Bashkirian speaker said that at the three latest sessions of the Council of Republics an agreement was reached on developing the mechanism for implementing the Federative Agreement. He also said that the next session which was originally scheduled to be held in Ioshkar-Ola April 5 with Yuriy Skokov, Secretary of the National Security Council, in attendance has been put off to between April 15 and 20 and will be held in Moscow.

The recess in the negotiations with the Russian Federation was attributable, he said, to change of Bashkortostan's government and complications with appointing the head of the Russian delegation (it used to be former vice premier Makharadze - IF [INTERFAX]). Ufa, said Rakhimov, welcomed the fact that "at last, vice premier Yuriy Yarov has finally been approved" in this post. The fifth round of the Russo-Bashkirian talks, he said, is expected to be held in Ufa April 5 to 10 and will discuss property sharing and foreign trade.

Sakhalin, Kurils Deputies Approve New Oblast Head

LD0204190493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1335 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Belovitskiy]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, 2 Apr—The deputies of Sakhalin and the Kurils have taken a major step toward resolving the conflict between the islands' branches of legislative and executive power. At a session of the oblast Soviet, held today, they accepted the nomination for the post of new head of the oblast administration that has been put forward by Russia's president.

After Boris Yeltsin has passed the appropriate decree, the governorship of Russia's only island oblast will go to the 54-year-old general manager of the Russian-Japanese joint enterprise "Pilenga Godo," Yevgeniy Krasnoyarov. He will replace Valentin Fedorov, Russian people's deputy and full member of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Yevgeniy Krasnoyarov intends to continue, with a few adjustments, the economic reforms on Sakhalin and the Kurils begun by his predecessor. He takes a fairly flexible line on the issue of the "Northern Territories." While recognizing the existence of the territorial problem, he is happy to let future generations of politicians solve it "when Russia attains Japan's level of prosperity."

Chechen Officials Comment on People's Deputies

LD0404230193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Report from Chechnya and interviews with Khusain Akhmadov, chairman of Parliament of Chechnya, and Chechen President Dzhokhar Dudayev, by correspondent Sergey Yegorov; from the "Itogi" program]

[Excerpt] [Yegorov] [passage omitted] In Chechnya as a whole there exists a wide range of opinion on this subject. Many consider that the people's deputies of Russia elected on the territory of Chechnya should surrender their powers. The Chechen Parliament back in December 1991 passed the relevant resolution, according to which all people's deputies of Russia should be recalled.

[Khusain Akhmadov] The Chechen-Ingush republic has fallen apart and the Chechen and Ingush republics have been formed. They have been recognized by the laws of the Russian Federation. And so deputies from a nonexistent republic are in the Supreme Soviet and [word indistinct]. This is an anachronism. It is a nonsense.

[Yegorov] Despite the serious differences between the president and Parliament of the Chechen Republic, on the question of the recall of deputies their opinions coincide. [addressing Dudayev] Whom is Deputy Ruslan Khasbulatov representing now?

[Dudayev] I do not know. You should ask that of the Supreme Soviet of Russia and the Russian people which he is representing now. That is the affair of Russia and the Russian Supreme Soviet and the Russian people.

[Yegorov] The absense of clear juridically documented relations between Chechnya and Russia does not really provide an opportunity to finally answer the question whether deputies from Chechnya are political vagabonds, as ill-wishers would have it, or whether they rightly and fully represent the electors who once voted for them.

Shakhray Attends Cooperation Conference in Krasnodar

Comments on Referendum, Decree on Cossacks

LD0304091693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1550 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Oleg Velichko and Viktor Zhilyakov]

[Text] Krasnodar, 2 Apr—Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray, in characterizing the internal political situation in Russia, has said that "the holding of a referendum and preterm elections are the only means left to resolve things peacefully."

Addressing a session of the Council of the Association for Socioeconomic Cooperation between the republics, krays, and oblasts of the northern Caucasus, Sergey Shakhray said: "We need to calmly guarantee that the referendum is held and abide by its results, regardless of the outcome, and then hold preterm elections for the post of president and for people's deputies at a Russia-wide level." Sergey Shakhray also believes that "the regions must make themselves heard on the settlement of the political conflicts at a federal level."

Replying to journalists' questions about the effects of the Russian president's decree on the Cossacks, Sergey Shakhray replied that "for the present, the decree has the character of an instruction, and those who suspended it acted incorrectly." "Without taking into account the Cossack movement and its interests, not a single problem of the northern Caucasus will be solved," he emphasized.

Resolution on Draft Program Passed

OW0204195493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] What can save Russia now is a healthy economy, horse sense and the regions. Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray made this statement on Friday [2 April] at a session held by the Council of Associations of Socioeconomic Cooperation of the Republics, Territories and Regions in the Northern Caucasus. In his words, to overcome the economic and political crisis peacefully Russia has to hold a national referendum and early elections.

"Following the national referendum, regardless of its outcome, we should hold early elections of all the branches of power," he emphasized.

Representatives of the governments of Adygea, Kabardino-Balkaria, Karachayevo-Cherkessiya, Northern Ossetia, administration heads of Stavropol and Krasnodar Territories and Rostov Region passed a resolution to draft a program of the region's socioeconomic development for 1993-1995. The Council members addressed prospects for developing the system of transportation, options for opening ports on Taman peninsula, construction of a railroad bypassing Ukraine, and many others.

In view of Georgia introducing its own currency beginning on April 5, the North Ossetian delegation asked the Council to adopt an appeal to Russia's government and Central Bank to permit the enterprises and organizations in Northern Ossetia to continue their accounting operations through the CBR offices at the Northern Caucasus or in other regions of the Russian Federation.

The participants of the conference also addressed security issued in the context of the ongoing national conflicts.

Further Shakhray Comment

OW0204235493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1933 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian Vice Premier Sergey Shakhray thinks that unless the Cossack movement and its interests are recognized, none of the North Caucasian problems can be solved. In an interview he gave INTERFAX in Krasnodar Friday [2 April] he said that the conflicts in the region can be resolved through negotiations between the peoples living there.

Commenting on the negative response of certain movements to the presidential decree on state support for the Cossacks, Shakhray said that the Cossack problem cannot be ignored. Cossacks had set up their own power structures before the decree was issued. As well as Cossacks, other national movements in the Caucasus have their militias. This suggests that it was not the decree that brought about the problem.

There is but one way to resolve it, through a constructive dialog such as those held with national movements. The qualities displayed by Cossacks such as patriotism, readiness to serve the country, discipline, and efficient use of the land must be put to the service of Russia, Shakhray said.

Another argument in favor of the presidential decree is, in his view, that "It is no secret that drafting into the Russian Army has become a great problem. In the fall of 1993 when two draft terms, the two year and 18 month ones, end and the men go home, the army may find itself without soldiers. For this reason Cossacks are an additional reserve for drafting and initial training of young people for service in the armed forces." Shakhray emphasized that Cossack units will be organic to the regular Russian Army and obey its regulations.

Exercises To Be Held in North Caucasian District

LD0204195093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1937 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Gondusov]

[Text] Moscow April 2 TASS—Command-staff exercises will be held in the North Caucasian District of Russian interior troops without the participation of personnel, Russian Interior Troop Commander Anatoliy Kulikov said here today. A group of officers and generals from Moscow headed by Kulikov will leave for the exercise area on Saturday [3 April].

In Kulikov's words, they aim to verify the ability of district and unit command to fulfill service and combat duties of the interior troops.

The choice of the North Caucasian District as the exercise site was not accidental, as the deteriorated crime situation in the region, the long peace-making mission of the interior troops in the state of emergency area in Northern Ossetia and Ingushetia prompt the command to give the district a priority in supply of personnel and material resources.

"Simultaneously with the district formation, we shall train commanders and staffs to analyze the situation and take correct decisions, including those on re-grouping and energetic actions of the troops," noted Kulikov.

The exercises to avoid re-location of personnel will focus on service-combat use of units when rendering assistance to territorial interior bodies in ensuring public safety, including the state of emergency regime.

Military Exercises Begin

LD0504110793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1058 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Gondusov]

[Text] Rostov-on-Don April 5 TASS—Russian interior troops began military exercises on the territory of the North Caucasian Military District on Monday [5 April]. The exercises are directed by Lieutenant-General Anatoliy Kulikov.

For a period of two weeks a group of officers and servicemen from Moscow will monitor the exercises assessing the capabilities of the district command, units and formations to analyze the situation and resolve military tasks given to interior troops.

In the first stage the inspection team checked the order of passing over information to officers of the military district, signals and commands and readiness to be dispatched to a designated area. Particular attention was drawn to the interaction between interior troops, formations and units of border troops, stationed on the territory of the region, and local security and interior bodies.

"Ensuring law and order, especially in rapidly deteriorating situations, much depends on efficient joint actions of territorial interior troops and interior bodies," Colonel Anatoliy Maydykov, an expert on the activity of law enforcement bodies in emergency situations, told ITAR-TASS on Monday. "The result depends on efficient analytical work of command structures, which is the main task of the current military exercises," Maydykov said.

Representatives of the Russian Interior Ministry and the Russian Ministry of Security have arrived to coordinate the exercises.

Chechnya To React to Exercises

OW0504185593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1621 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A Chechen tank brigade is conducting its planned exercises in Chechnya's Shali region. The Chechen military command declared that these maneuvers have nothing in common with the exercises organized by Russia's North-Caucasian military district.

Nevertheless, on Monday [5 April] the Chechen military command is expected to make known its reaction towards military training conducted by the Russian forces in close vicinity to Chechnya's borders.

International Affairs

U.S. Delegation Arrives To Examine Economic Advances

LD0404220393 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in English 2100 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Text] A delegation of the U.S. Congress headed by the majority leader, Richard Gephardt, arrived in Kiev today. The aim of the visit is to see how economic reforms are being realized in the republic and how far it advanced in the direction of a free market economy, to evaluate the development of democratic institutions and processes and lay the basis for transition to the new aid programs which were proclaimed by President Clinton. The delegation is due to meet with the top officials of Ukraine.

Kuchma Says No Nuclear Problem

OW0604105293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1028 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ukraine's Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma has urged the U.S. "to remember that Ukraine with a population of 52 Mn [million] is on the map of the former USSR". Talking to newsmen after Monday's [5 April] meeting with U.S. congressmen, led by the House's Democratic majority leader Richard Gephardt, he suggested that "Ukraine and other republics might have been forgotten at the Russo- American summit in Vancouver".

In Mr. Kuchma's words, he assured the congressmen that the problem of nuclear arms on the territory of Ukraine was non-existent. However, he declined comment on a statement by the Russian Government, deploring Ukraine's position toward the nuclear weapons on its soil. He said he was expecting the full text of the statement through official channels.

START I Ratification Linked to Security Guarantees

LD0604084293 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0500 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The parliament will ratify START I and the Nuclear Arms Non-Proliferation Treaty on the condition that Ukraine will be given guarantees of its security. This was stated by Ivan Plyushch at a meeting with the delegation of U.S. Congress representatives which took place on 5 April in Kiev.

Defense Ministry Protests Use of Fleet in Georgian War

AU0604091893 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 2 Apr 93 p 1

["Statement by Ukraine Ministry of Defense" in Kiev; date not given]

[Text] The Russian Federation Ministry of Defense has recently taken unilateral measures that do not contribute to a normalization of the situation regarding the question of building Ukraine's Naval Forces and Russia's Naval Fleet on the basis of the Black Sea Fleet.

The Yalta Agreement that Ukraine decided to sign for precisely this purpose is being constantly violated by Russia's Ministry of Defense.

Although invariably advocating adherence to the agreement, Russia's Ministry of Defense has been distorting the interpretation of the main underlying principles, expanding its own vision of the need for the existence of a transitional period, and putting tasks before the leadership of the Black Sea Fleet to change organizational-personnel structures, reduce units, remove combat technology, redeploy it elsewhere, and so on.

On orders from Moscow, the fleet ships with Ukrainian citizens are fulfilling unknown tasks in the armed conflict between Georgia and Abkhazia.

Without taking into account the interests of the state in which the ships are deployed and without coordinating its actions with Ukraine's Ministry of Defense, the command of the fleet, on instructions from Moscow, pays salaries to the personnel serving in the Black Sea Fleet in accordance with Russian rates and taking into account the rate of the karbovanets relative to the ruble.

This is despite the fact that Ukraine is financing the fleet from its own budget and that the Yalta Agreement on the inadmissibility of unilateral actions is valid.

The state has to suffer considerable losses, and the personnel serving in Ukraine's Naval Forces experiences moral damage.

Ukraine's Ministry of Defense believes that violations of the Yalta Agreement are inadmissible, because they tend to stir up hostility among the people in the army, cause moral and material losses to our state, and practically pull the Black Sea Fleet away from the leadership of the presidents of Ukraine and Russia.

Ukraine's Ministry of Defense is currently studying numerous proposals on preparing an appeal to Ukraine's Supreme Council requesting it to invalidate the Yalta Agreement that was concluded on 3 August 1992.

Belarus

Strategic Arms May Be Moved to Russia Ahead of Schedule

LD0204143893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1412 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By BELINFORM correspondent Leonid Tratsevskiy for TASS]

[Text] Minsk April 2 TASS— Former Soviet nuclear strategic weapons deployed in Belarus can be transferred to Russia earlier than in the envisaged seven-year period, according to Gennadiy Gichkin, head of the Russian delegation at talks with Belarusian military on the problem.

The fourth meeting of Russian and Belarusian experts which ended on Friday succeeded to practically complete the two major agreements—on the pull out of strategic forces to Russia and on the status of strategic units in Belarus, Gichkin told BELINFORM.

Mutually acceptable solutions to the problems were found, he said, adding that the agreements may be ready in the first half of April and will be submitted to prime ministers of both countries.

One problem which is yet to be settled concerns the sharing of property and construction of housing for servicemen of Russian strategic forces in Belarus. But the solution of the problem does not depend on the military, according to Gichkin.

U.S. Ambassador Hails Accord on Embassy Property

WS0604094893 Minsk BELINFORM in Russian 1428 GMT 5 April 93

[Text] The ceremony of signing an agreement on the lease of property to a foreign embassy has been held in Minsk for the first time in the history of Belarusian diplomacy. The document was signed by U.S. Ambassador David Swartz and Deputy Foreign Minister of Belarus Vladimir Astapenko. This also means that an 18th century mansion, situated in downtown Washington, will become the property of the Belarusian Embassy in the United States.

Speaking at the ceremony, David Swartz said the agreement is an important stage in the development of fruitful bilateral relations. The fact that the United States has purchased [as received] property in Belarus means that it is going to maintain close and long-term relations with the Republic.

Shushkevich Receives North Atlantic Assembly Delegation

LD0504201193 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 2000 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Text] Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislaw Shushkevich today received at the Belarusian parliament a North Atlantic Assembly delegation. He noted at the meeting that the experience acquired by the North Atlantic Assembly, a joint parliamentary body that for 40 years has been bringing European and North American legislators together, is extremely interesting and useful for Belarus. During a four-day stay in Belarus, the delegation members met Procurator General Vasil Shaladonaw, Deputy Foreign Minister Uladzimir Astapenka, representatives of various political parties, and members of a number of parliamentary commissions.

Fuel Shortage Prompts Prime Minister's Visit to Moscow

WS0604091393 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0300 GMT 6 Mar 93

[Text] On the afternoon of 5 April, Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich left for Moscow by plane to hold talks with Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. The visit was prompted by a fuel shortage in the Belarusian agricultural infrastructure. According to Vyacheslav Kebich, this situation can seriously complicate the spring sowing campaign. During the negotiations, the sides dealt in detail with the issue of Russian oil supplies, as well as other aspects of Belarusian-Russian economic relations. Vyacheslav Kebich returned to Minsk in the evening.

Working Group Formed To Expand Economic Ties With Russia

WS0604094693 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0300 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] According to the Belarusian Government's decision, a working group has been created in order to develop the basis of the economic union with Russia. The group is being headed by Vladimir Zalomay, chairman of the State Committee for CIS Matters. It will consider all suggestions with regard to the economic union.

Deputy Foreign Minister Visits Latvia, Discusses Ties

WS0504144993 Minsk RID in Russian 0925 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Belarusian relations with the Baltic republics are entering a new stage. This has been prompted by the dramatic changes in the political and economic life of once fraternal republics of the former USSR.

The 25-26 March visit to Riga by Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Ostapenko was devoted to the future relations between Belarus and Latvia. In Riga, Ostapenko met Latvian Minister of Foreign Affairs Andreyev, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Latvian Supreme Council. He also held talks with the chairmen of the Committees for Human Rights and Nationalities and representatives of the Department of Citizenship and Emigration. The RIA correspondent has been told at the Department of Bilateral Relations of the Belarusian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that an agreement has been reached to hold high level negotiations on the

introduction of the non-visa regime for Belarusian citizens crossing the border with Latvia and the legal status of Belarusian nationals living in the Baltic republic.

Moldova

Defense Minister Comments on NATO Meeting, 14th Army Issues

AU0304195193 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 1700 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Calin Petrescu report from Chisinau]

[Text] The Moldovan defense minister, Division General Pavel Creanga, recently participated in the meeting of the ministers of defense of NATO, East European countries, and countries of the former Soviet Union, which was held in the Belgian capital.

Summing up the activity carried out by the delegation of the Republic of Moldova, Mr. Ion (Mastac), chief of the Press Department of the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Moldova, emphasized in a statement, which he made today to Chisinau radio station, that at the Brussels meeting Mr. Pavel Creanga discussed Moldova's foreign policy by stressing in this context the idea of preserving peace.

The minister of defense also referred to the sociopolitical situation in the republic and to problems linked to the national Army. He emphasized the efforts that are being made to solve any military conflict and existing dissension, and to ensure the recognition of current borders. In this sense, he specified that the Republic of Moldova continues to act to ensure its own security within the framework of the European security system.

The defense minister also emphasized that one of the goals of the visit to Brussels was the development of cooperation with NATO structures. This process of rapprochement is of particular importance for peacefully solving problems in the Dniester region on the one hand, and for setting up the national Army of the Republic of Moldova on the other.

During his talks in Brussels, the minister of defense of the Republic of Moldova, Mr. Pavel Creanga, also discussed the problem of the 14th Army and of the Russian peacekeeping military forces deployed on the territory of the Republic of Moldova. He mentioned the fact that only their withdrawal can solve the conflict and contribute to the normalization of relations in the Eastern rayons of the Republic of Moldova.

Regarding the accord signed on 21 July last year between the Republic of Moldova and Russia, Mr. Pavel Creanga believes that the peacekeeping forces located in the conflict areas have fulfilled their mission and that at this point it is necessary to change these forces with other peacekeeping military contingents from countries holding a neutral position on the conflict in the Dniester region.

Tajikistan

Foreign Ministry Warns Afghanistan on Border Violation

LD0504131493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1235 GMT 5 Apr 93

[TIA "Khovar" correspondent Viktor Kozlov for TASS]

[Excerpts] Dushanbe, 5 Apr—The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Tajikistan has issued a strong protest against attempts to violate the Tajikistan state border by Afghanistan and against interference in the internal affairs of the republic. [passage omitted]

In connection with this, the Tajik Ministry of Foreign Affairs has warned that if any such actions were repeated, no one must be in any doubt that a decisive blow will be delivered to any force trying to disrupt the peaceful existence of the people in the republic.

[Moscow INTERFAX in English at 1225 GMT on 5 April adds: "The Tajik Foreign Ministry is 'seriously concerned with the situation on the Tajik-Afghan border,' reported sources in the republic's foreign policy department to Interfax. On Monday the Tajik Foreign Ministry gave Afghanistan's temporarily acting consul, Mohammad Umar Asir, a statement citing the impermissibility of intervention in the republic's internal affairs.

["On Tuesday the Tajik Foreign Ministry will hold a briefing on the situation along the border. Russian border troop representatives will participate in the briefing.

["In the past three days large armed groups have made battle attempts to cross the border into Tajikistan from Afghanistan. Special brigades of the Tajik National Security Committee, Russian border troops, and even the 201st Russian Motorized Infantry Division, stationed in regions along the Afghan border, were used to catch those crossing the border.

["In the fighting one Russian border guard, Sergeant N. Filippov, was killed; another was seriously wounded, and one suffered a contusion. Several of the fighters attempting to penetrate the border were taken into custody. Among them were former residents of Tajikistan who had undergone special preparation in fighting camps on Afghan territory. On Saturday, upon a proposal from the Foreign Ministry, UN military observer in Tajikistan Bent Agger visited the territory where the fighting took place."]

CSCE Representatives Arrive in Dushanbe

LD0204161993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1336 GMT 2 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Gridneva]

[Text] Dushanbe April 2 TASS—A CSCE mission headed by CSCE special envoy and Turkish Ambassador to Austria and International Organizations Hikmat Alp has arrived in Dushanbe to study the Tajik social, political and economic situation.

The delegation first visited the republican Foreign Ministry, where first Deputy Foreign Minister Erkin Rakhmatullayev informed Mr. Alp in detail on the republican situation. It was stressed despite current difficulties in Tajikistan, the republic seeks to act within the framework of basic documents of international organizations, which have admitted Tajikistan as their fully- fledged member.

Mr. Alp told correspondents he plans to meet republican parliament officials, the head of the U.N. mission in Tajikistan, representatives of local public and peacemaking organizations and average people to have an objective impression of social and political processes in Tajikistan. He said the information will be conveyed to the CSCE leadership to take corresponding decisions and make conclusions.

The CSCE team visit will last for four days.

Russian Forces Help Government Against Opposition Militants

OW0504212993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1920 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Kulyab Regiment of the 201st Russian Division, border guards, a special brigade of the National Security Committee and forces of the pro-government Popular Front of Tajikistan combed the Dastidjum wild-life preserve in the territory of the Moskovsky border guard detachment. Several groups of armed Tajik opposition militants crossed into that area from Afghanistan on April 2 and 3.

Russian division officers said fire emplacements were wiped out with the help of aircraft and armored vehicles. In the course of the operation more than 40 bodies were found. Two opposition militants were detained. Both are residents of Tajikistan, who have undergone military training at special camps in Afghanistan.

10 Russian Border Guards Abducted 5 Apr

LD0604090793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0855 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunaiskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—Ten servicemen from the Russian borderguard troops deployed in Tajikistan were abducted by unidentified militants on April 5.

ITAR-TASS was told at the press-bureau of the Russian Borderguard Command that the ten were captured during an attack of militants on two army vehicles near a post of the Khorog borderguard detachment.

The Russian Ministry of Security and the Borderguard Command are taking every necessary measure to secure the release of the Russian servicemen.

Uzbekistan

Karimov Says 'No Alternative' to Yeltsin

LD0504170093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1442 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Excerpt] Another report on today's news: A news conference in Tashkent on the occasion of Turkish President Turgut Ozal's official visit to Uzbekistan. Inter alia, the issue of Uzbekistani-Russian relations was highlighted. Here is what Uzbekistan President Islam Karimov said at the news conference:

[Begin Karimov recording] In my view, and I have said this before and will stand by it: There is no alternative to Yeltsin. If Boris Nikolayevich takes timely steps to resolve issues further by introducing certain adjustments into the reforms—primarily by taking into account the social question, the protection of the Russian population, the support for socially vulnerable groups of the population, but most importantly, by defining a specific concept, specific plans of implementing the reform, which would take into account, first and foremost, interests of the people—then I believe that democratic reforms begun by Russia will and must bring results.

My view is that should democracy, democratic and primarily social and political reforms fail to perform in Russia, we understand far too clearly what kind of impact this would have for the future of independent states which have emerged after the disintegration of the Union, including those in Central Asia. The power which we have today would be ousted by dictatorship. In this respect, taking all these factors into consideration, we declare firmly that reforms begun by Yeltsin must be continued to the end. We support this. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Turkish President, Delegation Continue Visit

LD0604100693 Tashkent Radio Tashkent Network in Uzbek 0600 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The visit of the Turkish state delegation led by President Turgut Ozal to Uzbekistan is continuing. According to the program, the delegation led by Turgut Ozal will be visiting Bukhara, Samarkand, and the scenic places there. The group of Turkish businessmen will be visiting enterprises and farms in Tashkent Oblast.

Cetin on Humanitarian Flights

TA0504164193 Ankara ANATOLIA in Turkish 1555 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Tashkent (AA)—Murat Cakmak reports—Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin has said that all humanitarian flights to Armenia over Turkey have been banned. However, he added, flights for which permission had been given earlier will be carried out, on condition that they are stopped and searched.

Cetin, who is accompanying President Ozal in his visit to the Turkic republics, told journalists in Tashkent that Turkey summoned the ambassadors of the countries extending aid to Armenia to the Foreign Ministry in Ankara and informed them of the situation.

Cetin said: "In light of Armenia's latest attack on Azerbaijani territory, all humanitarian flights over Turkey have been suspended. Unless these attacks stop and a withdrawal is carried out, the flights will be banned. However, there are certain flights for which permission was given earlier. Their times, duration and destination were registered. They will be carried out on condition that they are searched after they land in Turkey. No other flights to and from Armenia will be permitted under the present conditions."

Cooperation Agreements Signed With Malaysia

PM0604100393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 3

[Shahkabutdin Zaynutdinov report: "Malaysians Believe Uzbekistan Will Be an 'Asian Dragon' Too"]

[Text] Tashkent—The official visit to Uzbekistan by the Malaysian Government delegation headed by Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed has ended with the signing of a new package of mutually advantageous agreements between the two states.

It is envisaged that Malaysian specialists will take part in prospecting for and exploiting Uzbekistan's oil deposits and in setting up joint ventures to process raw materials—specifically, by producing edible vegetable oil, including palm oil. Agreements were signed on information exchange, as were protocols on cooperation in other economic spheres.

One member of the Malaysian delegation expressed the view that Uzbekistan, with such considerable natural and economic potential, could become an Asian "dragon" by the end of the century.

Armenia

President Meets U.S. Congressmen, Denies Support to Karabakh

OW0504204593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1919 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan has dismissed the charges that Armenia renders military support to the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh in their confrontation with Azerbaijan. As he received a group of U.S. Democrat congressmen, on Monday [5 April], he called for sending foreign observers to Nagorno-Karabakh, who would be able to see for themselves that such accusations are groundless.

Ter-Petrosyan blamed the continuing hostilities in Nagorno- Karabakh on Azerbaijan and Turkey, who, in his view, counted on resolving the dispute by force. President Ter- Petrosian said that Baku and Ankara had reduced to nothing several months of efforts by the world community to try to bring about truce in the region.

The Armenian President said Armenia's position remained unchanged: "We are for an early peace settlement of the conflict without any preconditions." At the first stage of a settlement there should be a cease-fire, followed by a peace conference in Minsk.

President Ter-Petrosyan said he hoped that the current visit by US congressmen would help them evaluate the situation in Karabakh more accurately in order to promote the search for a peace settlement.

Prime Minister Briefs U.S. Congressmen on Karabakh

NC0504205493 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1830 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Armenian Prime Minister Grant Bagratyan today received a delegation of U.S. congressmen led by Richard Lehman, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

The delegation is visiting the region to get acquainted with the political situation and has already visited Azerbaijan. The congressmen will leave Yerevan for Turkey, where they will meet with Turkish leaders and other officials.

The Karabakh problem and possibilities to resolve it peacefully were the focus of the meeting with the prime minister. They discussed the Nagorno-Karabakh self-defense forces' efforts to control Kelbadzharskiy Rayon and thereby eliminate the threat to the Lachin humanitarian corridor.

Azerbaijan describes these operations as Armenian acts of aggression against Azerbaijan, during which many peaceful citizens allegedly are killed. Bagratyan resolutely rejected this allegation and noted that the Karabakh forces have given citizens opportunities to leave the war zone.

The prime minister informed the guests about certain details of the Karabakh problem and about Azerbaijan's desire to [word indistinct] Nagorno-Karabakh. Armenia's position remains unchanged. Armenia is ready this very day to play a mediating role in getting talks started between Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan to declare a cease-fire and peacefully solve the problem. Armenia has formally declared this position many times during various international meetings. The war does not [words indistinct]. The only way out of the situation is through peace talks without any preconditions, the prime minister said.

In reply to a congressman's question on whether Armenia is helping Karabakh and is in a position to influence it, the prime minister said Armenia is assisting Nagorno-Karabakh, primarily by providing foodstuffs and electricity. Regarding military assistance, most of the Karabakh armed forces' weapons are those left behind by the Russian Army, he said. The rest are outright spoils of war seized by the people of Karabakh from the enemy during combat operations.

Referring to means at Armenia's disposal to influence Karabakh, the prime minister said such levers exist but cannot be used at the expense of Nagorno-Karabakh's people.

Addressing the congressmen, Bagratyan said Armenia hopes the United States will help in lifting the railway blockade, which would enable the Republic's economy to develop and solve numerous socioeconomic problems.

Lehman said that the congressmen will evaluate the results of their visits to Transcaucasia and Turkey and provide an accurate and detailed report to the U.S. Congress on the situation in the region.

State Ministers Sepuh Tashdzhyan and Armenak Gazaryan, Minister of Economy Armen Yegiazaryan, and other officials were present at the meeting.

Only 1.5 Million Cubic Meters of Gas Received Daily

OW0504183993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1621 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Armenia's Energy and Fuel Ministry' press center reported to Interfax that currently only one and a half million cubic meters of gas are delivered to the republic daily though Armenia's minimum gas requirements are 7.5 Mn cubic meters.

The press center explained that Georgia, through whose territory the gas main is laid, takes the lion share of gas due to be delivered to Armenia. Currently Georgia receives 18 Mn [million] cubic meters of gas every 24 hours.

Due to the shortage of fuel and energy, electric power is supplied to the flats of the Yerevan residents only three hours a day. The national television works 1.5-2 hours a day.

Over 100,000 Trees Cut Down for Fuel Over Winter

OW0504184193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1621 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Due to the energy crisis experienced in Yerevan this winter, over 100,000 trees were chopped down in the city to be used as firewood. The Yerevan city council reported to Interfax that Yerevan residents continue chopping down trees in order to have reserves for the next winter.

According to Yerevan's chief dendrologist Artashes Manaserian, 30 years would be needed to restore the green cover of the Armenian capital.

Russian Troops Complete Exercises in Gyumri

NC0304124293 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Text] The Russian troops stationed in Armenia have completed their military exercises, which were held in Gyumri. Fedor Reut, commander of the Russian troops in Transcaucasia, took part in the exercises. Armenian Defense Minister Vazgen Manukyan, other Defense Ministry officials, and commanders from the Republic's general staff also were present.

The Armenian Defense Ministry press service reported that talks were held between the Armenian and Russian military. The results of these talks were satisfactory.

Parliament Passes Law Naming Armenian as State Language

MK0304070693 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 3

[Armen Khanbabyan report: "Language Law Finally Adopted. There Will Be Fewer Signs in Russian, English"]

[Text] The Armenian parliament on 30 March finally passed a language law that has been under discussion for over a year. It was approved by 143 deputies' votes, which is probably a record of unanimity for the republic's Supreme Soviet.

The law is of a fairly lenient and sufficiently democratic character, which is why it compares favorably with similar documents regulating language practice in some other former Union republics. In particular, during the discussion, provisions envisioning limitations on the activity of Russian-language mass media outlets and mandatory proficiency in Armenian for the republic's citizens were dropped from the draft. The latter condition has migrated for the time being into a draft nationality law that cannot be expected to be passed any time soon. The requirement to return to classical, prerevolutionary spelling that had been abolished back in the early twenties was also abandoned. This appears to be correct, since otherwise a whole stratum in the national culture and literature of the Soviet period would have become unintelligible to succeeding generations.

Actually the new law reflects the linguistic reality that has taken shape in Armenia. For all that, it formalizes and regulates the use of Armenian as a state language because, without legislative underpinnings, a corresponding article in the Constitution, which incidentally existed back under the old regime, has been a fiction. The implementation of the law will inevitably be accompanied by certain difficulties—for instance, it will not be easy to ensure that all clerical work will be quickly and fully switched over to the national language, which is due to the presence of a substantial stratum of Russian-speaking personnel in ministries and agencies. For a long time, preference in employment at [Communist] party and state organizations was given precisely to Russian-speaking representatives of the indigenous population, since Moscow demanded that all paperwork be conducted in the language of interethnic communication. Difficulties will also arise for numerous refugees from Azerbaijan, whose number exceeds 200,000 and who for obvious reasons have poor command of their mother tongue. This can immediately put them at a disadvantage compared with the permanent residents of Armenia.

The law formalizes the practice of providing instruction in Armenian in all educational establishments and child-care institutions. Presumably, from now on there will be fewer notices and signs in Russian and English in the streets of Armenian cities.

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Receives U.S. Congressmen in Baku

OW0404144093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1253 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Five American congressmen arrived in Baku on Saturday [3 April]. The same day they conferred with President Abulfaz Elchibey. He told them that the U.S.A. must not remain indifferent to the destiny of Azeri civilians, who fell victim to a military aggression launched by Armenia.

Armenia and Azerbaijan, the congressmen told journalists, should reach an agreement between themselves. As for the U.S.A., it can give them aid in the implementation of their agreements.

The congressmen were expected to arrive in Baku on April 6. However they came earlier as a result of a letter

sent by Abulfaz Elchibey to President Bill Clinton, Interfax was told by a member of the Azeri president's staff, who preferred to remain anonymous.

U.S. Ambassador Voices Concern Over Armenian Aggression

LD0504195793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1927 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By AZERTAC correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Baku April 5 TASS—Azerbaijani President Abulfaz Elchibey received U.S. Ambassador Richard Miles at his request today. The two discussed the serious situation in the republic's Kelbadzhar and Fizuli districts. Miles voiced great concern over Armenia's aggressive actions against Azerbaijan.

Elchibey Claims Russian Servicemen Aiding Armenians

OW0504200793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1918 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Ministry of Defense of Azerbaijan informs that the republic's forces are engaged in heavy fighting with Armenian forces in the Makdaker district of Nagorno-Karabakh as well as in the Fizulinsky and Kelbadzharsky districts of Azerbaijan. According to the Ministry-provided information, an Armenian tank has been destroyed in the Fizulinsky district.

Meanwhile, the President of Azerbaijan Abulfaz Elchibey in an interview to foreign journalists on Monday announced that the Armenian army concentrates troops and material at the Garutskoe and Martuninskoe directions, aiming a major blow at Fizuli. He said the Armenian forces have approached the city and are currently in control of the nearby heights, bombing the city with shells and missiles. However, he claims, two heights were recaptured on Monday and the Azerbaijani forces proceed with defense of the city.

Previously the Ministry of Defense of Azerbaijan informed that fighting is going on two kilometers away from Fizuli.

Having accused Armenia of intentions to widen the occupation zone A. Elchibey stated that foreign terrorist mercenary groups participate in the fighting on the opposite side as do Russian servicemen, who according to Elchibey devised operation plans and directed and instructed the Armenian troops. In this connection, the President declared: "naturally I would like to know the attitude of the Russian Government on this, however, most likely it would not be the official position of the Russian State but rather of certain forces that we would like to reveal." The president assured that Azerbaijan still desires a peaceful solution to the conflict. "Sooner or later this conflict shall be resolved via the negotiating table," he said accentuating that the republic is ready to take steps towards political settlement of the conflict. The President objected to halting the negotiating process within the Council for Security and Co-operation in Europe. "We demand that the Armenian occupational forces leave Kelbadzhar and that the negotiations continue," declared the President of Azerbaijan.

Elchibey Addresses Envoys on 'Extremely Grave' Situation

PM0604102793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Sokhbet Mamedov report: "Azerbaijani President on Events in Kelbadzharskiy Rayon"]

[Text] Baku—Azerbaijani President Abulfaz Elchibey has received ambassadors and heads of diplomatic missions in Baku. This unplanned meeting was prompted by the extremely grave position in which the 60,000-strong population of Kelbadzharskiy Rayon on the border with Armenia finds itself.

The president told those present that the Armenian Armed Forces, having launched a major offensive, have surrounded Kelbadzharskiy Rayon and embarked on the mass annihilation of the civilian populace. In the past four days of bloody fighting only 8,000 people have been successfully evacuated. The fate of those left behind—including tens of thousands of women, old people, and children—is cause for concern. Many people are trying to get out of the area through snow-covered mountain passes. According to preliminary information, this has led to fatalities and missing persons.

The continuing aggression, the president noted, poses a major threat to peace in the Caucasus, and also in the Near and Middle East. A. Elchibey expressed the hope that the ambassadors, heads of foreign diplomatic missions in Baku, and journalists would inform their states and the world public of the truth about the situation in Azerbaijan. The scale of the tragedy is great, and the numbers of people killed, wounded, or missing are hard to estimate. Reports from the combat zone show that such people run into the hundreds.

The Azerbaijani National Assembly's appeal to parliaments, the European Parliament, the CSCE, and the United Nations and the statement from the republic's Foreign Ministry assess the offensive actions by Armenia's Armed Forces and the occupation of Kelbadzharskiy Rayon as an act of aggression. These documents demand that the United Nations and the CSCE take immediate measures to put a stop to the aggressive war which Armenia is waging against Azerbaijan.

In the opinion of experts, Armenia's occupation of Kelbadzharskiy Rayon means that Azerbaijan is being cut off from the entire southern part of its border territory. Combat operations are thus gradually nearing the borders of other states.

Meanwhile the republic authorities are attempting to evacuate the stricken people of Kelbadzharskiy Rayon by helicopter. But a helicopter carrying civilians was shot down 1 April, and the helicopter landing strip has been destroyed by an enemy air strike.

Envoy Claims Russian Army Involved in Armenian Attacks

LD0604114193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By correspndent Peslyak; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A news conference has just finished in the office of the Azerbaijani permanent representative [as heard]. Speaking at the news conference, the country's vice president and also Ambassador Khikmet Gadzhi-Zade reported a large-scale offensive, which resulted in the seizure of 10 percent of Azerbaijan's territory. Fifteen thousand civilians are surrounded. The ambassador claimed that there have been deaths and cases of hypothermia, as well as people trying to go into the mountains to escape death and ethnic cleansing in the Kelbadzharskiy Rayon. The ambassador stated that the Armenian offensive is developing into Azerbaijan's Fizulinskiy and Tauzskiy Rayons.

It has also been reliably established that sub-units of the Russian Federation 7th Army are taking part in the aggression, Gadzhi-Zade said. Who gave them the order? We are not making a link between this and Yeltsin or the Russian Federation parliament, but then who? General staff, Army command, or is this a case of mass unauthorized use of armor? Who in Russia would need this? the journalists asked. Maybe the conservatives wishing to restore the old USSR and to bring republics under Moscow, Gadzhi-Zade answered. Otherwise, where do the attackers get gasoline, rockets or tanks? He also reminded that Andrey Kozyrev and Warren Christopher had stated Russia's position in their joint statements. On 25 March our minister flies to Geneva, and on 27 March aggression starts. The minister maintains that the world community, the United Nations Organization and the CSCE must call an aggressor an aggressor, and apply comprehensive sanctions.

Government Calls For UN Session on Armenian 'Aggression'

LD0504195193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1845 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations, 5 Apr—Azerbaijan requested today that a session of the UN Security Council be held to discuss the "wide- scale Armenian aggression against Azerbaijan." The resquest is set out in a letter from Azerbaijani President Abulfaz Elchibey to the secretary general of the United Nations and the chairman of the UN Security Council. The letter was handed to the addressees by Gasan Gasanov, Azerbaijan's permanent representative to the United Nations.

A letter from Aleksandr Arzumanyan, Armenia's permanent representative to the United Nations, was also distributed here today. It was addressed to the chairman of the Security Counci and interpreted the current events as being the result of "a mass offensive" by Azerbaijan's regular armed forces. The offensive, the ambassador pointed out, was aimed at the Mardakert Rayon in Nagorno- Karabakh and the Lachin humanitarian corridor on Nagorno-Karabakh's southern border. In response to this attack, the Karabakh self- defense forces were compelled to take decisive countermeasures to protect their own vitally important interests. "The Armed Forces of the Republic of Armenia did not participate in carrying out a single one of these measures," the letter states.

Government Asks Compatriots Abroad To Help Refugees

OW0504201393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1918 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Government of Azerbaijan has declared that 10 percent of the republic's territory is under occupation by Armenian forces. In an Address to Azerbaijanis abroad it has declared that apart from a large portion of Nagorno-Karabakh "Armenia also occupies two districts of Azerbaijan: Lachinsky and Kelbadzharsky." It is also stressed that a half million compatriot refugees ousted from Armenia and the occupied areas within Azerbaijan were replenished with another 60 thousand as a result of the military activities of the Armenian forces in the last few days. In connection with this, the Government has appealed to all Azerbaijanis of the world to help the settlement of the refugees. "Substantial quantities of drugs and food, doctors, specialists and funding are required." reads the address.

Army Situation Near Fizuli 'Remains Difficult'

OW0604105693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1028 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Despite some success in battles Monday [5 April], the situation of the Azerbaijani army near the regional center of Fizuli, which borders on Karabakh, "remains difficult." The Azerbaijani Defense Ministry reported this to INTERFAX on April 6. Battles are still going on a few kilometers outside the city.

On Monday, the ministry noted, the Azerbaijani army succeeded in driving Armenian divisions from dominant peaks, from which they had been directly firing on Fizuli. Six Armenian tanks were knocked out in the past two days.

Chairman of the Azerbaijani parliament Isa Gambarov, who is in Fizuli, said Monday in an interview on national television that the circumstances of the Azerbaijani army in Fizuli had "improved somewhat." Meanwhile, according to the Azerbaijani Defense Minister, Armenians are still advancing deep into Azerbaijani territory in the Kelbadzhar Region. They seized the regional center last Friday. The Azerbaijani army is taking efforts to save the civilians trapped within the Armenian encirclement. According to information from Baku, 5000 persons are still located there. About 55,000 were evacuated in the past few days.

President of Azerbaijan Abulfaz Elchibey, INTERFAX was told by his press service, had telephone conversations Monday with the Egyptian foreign minister and the Israeli prime minister. They discussed the difficult situation which has developed in Azerbaijan. Elchibey asked them to express their stances on Armenia's military aggression against Azerbaijan.

Elchibey Appoints Military Commanders

NC0304205493 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 3 Apr 93

["Instructions" by President Abulfaz Elchibey on appointment of military commanders in cities and rayons; dated 3 April 1993—read by announcer]

[Text] In compliance with paragraph 4 of decree No. 503, dated 2 April 1993, on the declaration of a state of emergency in Azerbaijan, the list of military commanders in cities and rayons is approved as follows:

1. Baku: Police Major General Allakhverdiyev Abdullah Guseyn ogly, head of the directorate of police in Baku.

2. Gyandzha: Abbasov Nadir Aydin ogly, director of police in Gyandzha.

3. Yevlakh: Mamedov Vahid Iskender ogly, director of police in Yevlakh.

4. Lenkoran: Aliyev Ali-Esad Kud ogly, director of police in Lenkoran.

5. Mingecheur: Deryayev Suleyman Yemen ogly, director of police in Mingecheur.

6. Agdamskiy Rayon: Mamedov Kutalyb Goksad ogly, commander of military unit No. 708.

7. Agdzhabedinskiy Rayon: Gadzhiyev Pir-Said Gadzhiverdi ogly, deputy commander of military unit no. 704.

8. Astara Rayon: Kuliyev Ibragim Orudzh ogly, director of police in Astara Rayon.

9. Balakhany Rayon: [name indistinct] Vahid Isgal ogly, director of police in Balakhany Rayon.

10. Kazakhskiy Rayon: Sadykhov Islam Nazar oglu, commander of military unit No. 707.

11. Kubatlinskiy Rayon: Mukhtarov Rasim Mamed-Ali oglu, commander of military unit No. 706.

12. Busar Rayon: Mamayev Mekhti Khamdi ogly, deputy head of the Internal Affairs Ministry Public Security Department.

13. Zangelanskiy Rayon: Sabana Firudin Sharif ogly, commander of military unit No. 865.

14. Kelbadzharskiy Rayon: Mamedov Nizami Mansur ogly, commander of military unit No. 155.

15. Kedabekskiy Rayon: Rustamov Dzhangir Iskender ogly, commander of military unit No. 861.

16. Terterskiy Rayon: Bagirov Isa Dzhan ogly, director of police in Terterskiy Rayon.

17. Tauzskiy Rayon: Aliyev Murad Guseyn ogly, military commissar and commander of military unit No. 812.

18. Fizulinskiy Rayon: Khamidov Murad Tarbiz ogly, commander of military unit No. 702.

19. Dzhalalabadskiy Rayon: Dzhafarov Azad Dzhafar ogly, head of department, Internal Affairs Ministry Public Security Administration.

20. Dzhebrailskiy Rayon: [name indistinct] Geydar Kemal ogly, commander of military unit No. 896.

21. Shemshirskiy Rayon: Mukhamadov [name indistinct] Mamed ogly, commander of military unit No. 130.

[Signed] Abulfaz Elchibey, president of Azerbaijan
[Dated] Baku, 3 April 1993

Georgia

Shevardnadze Discusses Policy, Abkhazia, Russian Relations

LD0404154393 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1120 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Interview with head of state Eduard Shevardnadze by Ostankino observer Andrey Skryabin, correspondents Yuliy Semenov of Mayak Radio, and Lyudmila Telen of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; Shevardnadze speaks from a studio in Tbilisi, correspondents speak from a studio in Moscow—live; from the "Live Dialogue" program]

[Excerpts] [Skryabin] Hello, esteemed viewers. Today we have a live link-up between Tbilisi and the Ostankino studio. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, the head of state and chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia, will take part in our broadcast today and answer your questions. [passage omitted]

Allow me to present to you the journalists who are working in the Ostankino studio. This is Lyudmila Telen, observer from MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI

newspaper; Yuliy Semenov, observer from Mayak radio; and myself, Andrey Skryabin, Ostankino television observer. [passage omitted]

[Skryabin] And now I can see that Eduard Amvrosiyevich has appeared on the screen. Eduard Amvrosiyevich, can you hear us?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, quite well.

[Skryabin] So I will continue, on a range of questions connected with the Russian Army, and questions of Georgian internal and foreign policy. [passage omitted]

[Semenov] So my first question, esteemed Eduard Amvrosiyevich, was this: Some of your most recent harsh political acts and statements do not tie in very well with your political image, the image of a person who we know quite well, both from your previous posts and from your broad political activity. My question is this: To what extent are your policies, which you are pursuing, exactly your policies? To what extent are you pursuing them sincerely? Or is this some kind of balanced situation, because of influence or perhaps pressure on you?

[Shevardnadze] First of all I would like to say that the policy now pursued by the Georgian parliament and by the Georgian Government is also my policy, the policy backed as a matter of principle by the population, by the people of Georgia. That is the first point.

And the second point is that in principle any policy is naturally dictated by actual circumstances in this or that area, and in particular inside the country. Therefore the harshness you mentioned does indeed exist, but the present situation is far from easy; it is hard, and conditions of life, the conditions in which the independent state is being created, are really harsh and hard. This is what, in my view, explains certain nuances of my utterances and my speeches.

[Telen] If you will allow me, I would like to specify the question. Mr. Chairman, some people say that the limits of your political independence are to a large extent determined by the stance of those who work beside you in politics, and in particular, by the stance of the defense minister, Tengiz Kitovani. Please tell us to what extent your views coincide, and whether there are any fundamental differences with regard to Georgia's key problems between you and Mr. Kitovani.

[Shevardnadze] You know, it is not by chance that I have mentioned the parliament. In principle, we are all MPs, deputies of our supreme assembly, as it were, the supreme legislature. And there we all sit as equals, working out our positions on various matters. Therefore even if there are certain differences, certain shades, as it were, even certain contradictions between individual MPs, we are eliminating these differences by our joint efforts, thanks to the parliament's support, as it were.

As far as my personal views are concerned and those of Tengiz Kitovani, in essence there are no significant differences.

[Semenov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, our conversation today—it's fine, I would say, at least that's how it has begun—is nevertheless taking place to the sound of shooting. There has even a report today that there are exchanges of fire on the Gumista river. The conflict between Georgia and Abkhazia, or in the Abkhazia region, is taking on a protracted, chronic nature. What do you think? Are there people who are interested in this conflict continuing?

[Shevardnadze] Since the conflict has arisen, then it is an elementary truth that someone has an interest in it. Either one side or the other. I have had to speak on more than one occasion and say that the Georgian government—if they are people who think realistically—could not be interested in unleashing this conflict. Because there is collapse, the country is hungry and there are thousands of problems in the sphere of social life, the economy and in the construction of a new state. Such a country never strives toward conflicts. And I do not think that Abkhazia was very enthusiastic about the idea of unleashing war. I think, nevertheless—I do not know, maybe I am mistaken—but I want to say that there is a some kind of third force, a third force which likes this conflict. Unfortunately many facts indicate that this third factor is the determining one when we talk about the reasons for the rise, the unleashing of this conflict.

[Semenov] There is no doubt that mafia structures have an interest in this, they live off the unhappiness of people everywhere. And who else? Are there any political forces in your view?

[Shevardnadze] There are mafia structures, naturally. They are a cruel people, you know this. But there are certain circles in Russia and Russian society—it is difficult for me to speak about this but I must say it—who have been specializing for decades, not only in recent years, but for decades, I mean in the former Soviet Union [sentence as heard]. It is a long story. They have very cleverly used insignificant contradictions which naturally evolve between the two peoples in various fields. It seems to me these well-known circles constitute this third force. They have contributed to the fact that things have reached the stage of armed conflict.

These two peoples have never fought throughout history, never. We have lived together for centuries, these really are peoples who are kindred and close in spirit and traditions. This is the first time in history that war has scorched our land, and these peoples have clashed. Therefore we will probably speak of the causes later, and history will have its say. The main thing now is to seek a way out of this crisis.

[Telen] Mr. Chairman, you have quite fully outlined the range of problems connected with the causes, although you say that the causes will be studied in the future. Nevertheless, the more complex the causes, the more important it is to counter them with some kind of constructive idea that might lead this conflict into quite a different situation. What, for instance, is your attitude

toward the idea of a federal set-up in Georgia, and do you think that this idea might solve all the internal problems that arose during the period of the conflict in [South] Ossetia and are now continuing in Abkhazia? Or do you think that this idea is unrealistic for Georgia?

[Shevardnadze] Lyudmila Olegovna, I do not think that a federal set-up is a panacea for all these troubles or that the raising of this issue, even were we to undertake such a step, would automatically resolve and remove all the differences that have arisen among us of late. I would not now start to run ahead of events, since our first meeting of the Constitutional Commission took place yesterday. Evidently it will take a year to create and draw up a new constitution. Its draft will be discussed by the people at large by means of a general referendum. After the adoption of the constitution we will determine what the set-up will be and what course we will choose. I do not rule out the possibility that the principles of federalism or a federal state set-up will be taken into consideration; or perhaps we may have some other kinds of approach. It is difficult for me to speak about this at present, since the commission has only just set about its work.

One thing, however, one thing is clear. I am profoundly convinced that Abkhazian autonomy will remain. There are essentially no major differences in our society about that. All the rights—and I emphasize this—all the rights in all areas and fields of the Abkhazian people, and each citizen of Abkhazia will be protected by the constitution and by the state's standpoints.

[Skryabin] Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me, I would like to mention a few telephone calls. There are quite a few of them, more than 20 already, and all of them are similar. German Grupinov from Moscow, Manzinov from Moscow, Tatyana Ivanovna Nozdrina from Moscow, Atrashkevich from Severodvinsk etc—from many towns, Moscow, Kiev, Vladivostok, Bendery etc. The essence of all these calls boils down to the following idea: For how long will the war in Abkhazia continue, and is it possible to settle the conflict by peaceful means? All these calls are anti-war. And I have the following question for you in this connection, perhaps, it is of a general nature: What is the prospect for resolving the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict, I mean both a military and political solution? What way, what prospect can you see of resolving the awful situation which has evolved there at present?

[Semenov] Andrey Georgiyevich, I also have one question from a viewer from Abkhazia, Anatoliy [word indistinct]. He proposes a rather naive way out, in my opinion. He challenges you as if one can thus resolve a serious conflict. I would like to hear a somewhat serious and fundamental reply. What prospects and what real opportunities for resolving this conflict can you see?

[Shevardnadze] I always treat seriously any questions, even those that are not serious. As for the way out and my attitude, from the very first days I could see the only way out to be in a peaceful solution to this conflict. I have repeatedly said that we did not want to fight, and a completely different task was set for the subunits that were redeployed in Abkhazia. I do not want to speak about this, since we have stressed this many times.

From the very beginning, when the first, so to speak, incidents and first complications became obvious and blood was shed, I proposed a dialogue. And I propose a dialogue now. I immediately agreed to Russia and the Russian leadership being a mediator. With great enthusiasm, I would put it this way, we started working out measures to eliminate the causes of this conflict with the participation of President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and other Russian state figures. We signed the agreement of 3 September in Moscow, as you will recall, and it was enthusiastically hailed, I should say, throughout Georgia, Russia, and Abkhazia. But then it so happened that these agreements just did not work. I reaffirm even now, that this is the basis, the provisions of that treaty, of that agreement, and they remain, the basis, as it were, is still here. It is on this basis that settlement can be achieved.

What is required at present? I believe that serious adjustments are called for, and if Russia wants to retain its mission as mediator, it should seriously reshape its policy. It should indeed. That is, it should pursue a realistic course, doing its part to settle the conflict. Whereas what is being done today has quite an opposite effect. Therefore the issue should be settled within the framework of the treaty, of the agreement signed in Moscow on 3 September.

There is one more aspect. Of late, the Security Council has been actively involved in the process of settling the conflict. Two Security Council resolutions have been adopted, and accordingly we are now expecting a mission.. It seems to me that with the active involvement of the UN Security Council, and with active dialogue between Abkhazia and Georgia, we can achieve the fulfillment of our aim, i.e. a peaceful settlement of the conflict. The country will calm down, Georgia will calm down, including its constituent part, Abkhazia.

[Telen] Mr. President, from what you have said, it is patently obvious that you are not quite happy with Russia's position in this conflict. But you have not said what exactly you regard as inconsistencies in Russia's policy. Is it connected with the influence on the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict of certain circles within Russia's authorities, or maybe you see some other reasons? Could you therefore specify what you see as inconsistency in Russia's policy, and with which figures in the Russian leadership do you associate these inconsistencies?

[Shevardnadze] Everything was done correctly when we worked on the 3 September agreement together. Everything was correct, and I have to point out Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's special role in compiling this important document. But then, when it came to the specific and concrete realization of the agreement by these people, there were plenty of breaches and deviations, as

it were, from these principles, which unfortunately led to the further intensification and complication of the situation. In particular, I mean the illegal and, I would say, irresponsible behavior of many military commanders serving in Abkhazia, in particular in Gudauta. I have had to speak about this several times. I understand that it is, as it were, unpleasant to tell a Russian person, citizen, who is listening to us or watching our television broadcast, but I have to emphasize that certain military commanders, precisely military commanders of fairly high rank, are behaving in an unfitting manner.

So, I do not think that this situation is irremediable. I understand that the Russian leadership has its own problems, and quite difficult and complex ones, as it were; Boris Nikolayevich probably also has them, but I very much hope that after his return to his own country we will nonetheless be able to sort out our affairs more concretely and specifically and in detail, and smooth the relations between our two states. This, I emphasize, is the basis for settling the Abkhaz conflict.

[Skryabin] Thank you for your answer, Eduard Amvrosiyevich. Allow us to continue on this theme. Are the positions of Russian generals on Georgian territory and the Russian government adequate in your view, on their behavior? And is the Russian army in Georgia not becoming a kind of independent force, directed silently from Russia?

[Shevardnadze] You know, if one speaks on the whole about the state of affairs in those Russian Army units stationed in Georgia, I would not say that we have come across incorrect conduct by the Russian units. The matter particularly concerns Abkhazia, when we have encountered open interference in our internal affairs, where towns are being bombed, where people are being killed, and where the Russian generals themselves do not deny that it is they who have been carrying out strikes on the town of Sukhumi. I will give you a figure: Recently 110 people were killed in air strikes, including 35 Russian citizens, in Sukhumi alone.

When I was speaking about several negative aspects of Russia's participation in the conflict, in the settlement—in essence its participation—I did not mention the position of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. The Supreme Soviet of Russia has repeatedly adopted resolutions insulting the Georgian state and insulting the dignity of every citizen of Georgia. By the way, even now the draft of the Supreme Soviet, which has made a lot of noise, is still around, it demands discussion on the question of Abkhazia joining the Russian state. One can even recollect the treaty of 1810 when the Abkhazian principality took the decision to be part of the Russian state, this treaty, this agreement, as if has not been denounced and therefore there are all legal grounds there to discuss the issue of Abkhazia becoming part of the Russian state. Incidentally, all principalities joined Russia in the same way. There were a lot of them in Georgia at the time. I have mentioned this because, of course, this approach, which is not justified and which, I would say, is not a very serious approach, complicates the solution of the main issue of ending bloodshed and settling the conflict. I would like to stress that I hope very much that we will be able to, that our state will have enough wisdom and responsibility to one's people in order to settle the matter.

[Semenov] Mr. Chairman! Perhaps, a summit between you and President Yeltsin might help to remove all these layers? Is there an opportunity to make Russian-Georgian consultations more active? I know that next week you will pay an important visit to Ukraine. What about an official dialogue with Russia? As far as I know, a draft of a full-scale Russian-Georgian treaty has been prepared. What is the state of affairs in this respect?

[Shevardnadze] I have more than once spoken in public about my readiness to meet Boris Nikolayevich. But you know, recently certain difficulties have arisen for him. At present he has left for very important talks. Now I confirm again that I am ready to meet him anywhere in Moscow or in another town, especially Tbilisi, but at the moment another possibility is being discussed. As I discovered yesterday—Russian Ambassdor Zemskiy handed this report to me—the Russian leadership has taken a decision to make General Grachev the head of the Russian delegation at the Russian-Georgian talks. He is coming to Sochi and is inviting—I do not want to say that he is sending for—is inviting our delegation there. We have only just met and discussed this proposal and have decided to send a delegation there to be headed by Tengiz Sigua, prime minister of the Georgian Republic, the Georgian state, along with Kitovani and other leaders, but I nevertheless see this as the first step toward a meeting, and a summit will certainly be necessary in order to finally determine our principled relations.

As regards the treaties and all the other documents, you know, in principle they have been prepared. A little time is necessary in order to put them into shape. There is a major treaty, it has almost been agreed, all the clauses and aspects of this treaty. There are economic agreements, there are draft agreements on the status of troops, on the schedule for their stay, and so on. There are no particular disagreements. I think that here we are much hindered by the position of the Russian Supreme Soviet in settling our bilateral relations. In essence the Russian Supreme Soviet is torpedoing the Russian-Georgian talks, in essence the Supreme Soviet is forbidding the Russian leadership to hold talks on economic issues, and on certain others, and on resolving the issue of the Abkhaz conflict, but I think that we will not go far with such preliminary conditions.

[Telen] Mr. Chairman, you mentioned the coming talks between the Russian and Georgian delegations in Sochi. Tell me, please, do you know what authority General Grachev will have when he comes to the talks, and—this of course you know—could you not say what authority the Georgian delegation will have at the talks?

[Shevardnadze] As far as I know, General Grachev has been confirmed as head of the delegation, and naturally he is fully empowered to hold talks and take part in the preparation of the documents which will eventually be signed at the highest level.

[Telen] Does that include a political agreement between Georgia and Russia?

[Shevardnadze] Quite understandably, since the delegation is being headed by the minister of defense, priority attention will be given to issues connected with the presence of the Russian Army in Georgia. Well, we are ready, so to speak, for such a dialogue. The Georgian prime minister will also have the necessary powers to hold these negotiations in a serious and substantive way taking account of mutual interests.

[Skryabin] Eduard my friend, I have the following question for you—if you like, a lightning interview giving an answer of 15-20 seconds to a viewer's question. Dzhagilev from Tashkent asks whether in you opinion Georgia will in time become a member of the CIS. Fifteen seconds!

[Shevardnadze] I do not think that it is going to do so, inasmuch as my position on this issue has been well known right from the beginning. As far as the people's attitude is concerned, they are not in favor, so to speak, and do not favor joining later.

[Skryabin] Thank you. Sergey Petrovich Kharitonov from Moscow says that Georgia has refused to allow Armenia joint patrolling of the gas pipeline. Is Georgia doing anything, and what is Shevardnadze's attitude toward the bandit forays in his territory?

[Shevardnadze] Everything that Armenia receives, everything received by our neighboring country and state, a fraternal country, is received through Georgian territory. We are doing everything possible, so to speak, to ease the difficult lot of this people. Unfortunately it is not only the Armenian people, not only Armenia, but ourselves too who are suffering from these explosions and acts of sabotage. I want now to remind you why troops and units were deployed in the territory of Abkhazia. They were deployed there in order to restore train movement. The movement of trains had for six months been closed down, and the Armenian and the Georgian economies had suffered seriously to the extent of billions and billions of rubles. That unfortunately is the situation in which we now exist. There are no grounds to be suspicious of the position of the Georgian leadership. We very much want to continue living in peace and friendship with our nearest neighbor.

[Skryabin] Thank you. [words indistinct] from Moldova asks about your position on the introduction of peacekeeping forces into Abkhazia, drawn from the Russian troops in the Dniester region.

[Shevardnadze] As far as peacekeepers are concerned, I don't know, but I know that some have appeared in Abkhazia as volunteers, as it were, and I cannot name names, but we know they have taken part in military operations.

[Skryabin] Thank you. Another question. Sergey Petrovich Ivanov from Moscow is asking you a direct question. Why could Georgia leave the Soviet Union, but Abkhazia cannot leave Georgia on the same basis?

[Shevardnadze] Here we evidently have to get the elementary rules sorted out, as it were, and putting the question just like that seems to me to mean that people have a very slight understanding of what the sovereignty of an independent state means.

[Skryabin] Thank you. [Words indistinct] if Gamsakhurdia comes back to Georgia, will he be tried, and if so, for what?

[Shevardnadze] I am not the procurator general. There are lots of different criminal and administrative and terrorist, [changes thought] I don't know to what extent involved or not involved. Time will evidently tell, as it were. As far as his return is concerned, he has made no such attempt or announcement.

[Skryabin] Igor Aleksandrovich Makarov, Moscow. Do you believe media censorship is essential?

[Shevardnadze] No, I am absolutely opposed, absolutely opposed to censorship, and there were several attempts, as it were, there were suggestions that in connection with the special situation in the country, with the military situation, but I remain absolutely opposed and remain a supporter of free speech and a free press.

[Skryabin] Thank you. As I understand it, we have already discussed the two main problems we have talked about, the Abkhaz conflict and relations with Russia.

[Semenov] I have a question on the internal situation in Georgia.

[Skryabin] Go ahead.

[Semenov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich. In your time you became well- known, perhaps for the first time, as one of the first party and republican leaders who began an open fight against crime, at home in Georgia, first in Tbilisi and then in the republic as a whole, but now you probably know better than we do how complicated the crime situation in Georgia is. Do you have any basis to hope to get it all under control?

[Shevardnadze] We are trying, even though very slowly, to reorganize our work and to step up work, step up the campaign against the criminal world. I am speaking specifically about the criminal world because, unfortunately, this is not just a Georgian phenomenon today. During the transition to a new state of the economy, of society, of politics or, if you like, political system, and so on, one naturally always sees the revival of crime, the particular revival of crime, of criminal elements. Georgia too, has encountered this evil.

In the capital now, for example, people are noticing that the campaign has indeed been strengthened in earnest, though these are just the first steps. Also, the appropriate special-purpose formations—I mean police formations—are being set up to guard the railroad lines and main roads. We are gravely suffering in the economic field, so to speak, from corrupt elements. The appropriate subunits are also being set up for this. So, on the whole, we are quite determined on this score, and I believe that we have to ensure order and, in this respect, we have immense and, I would say, nationwide support. The people are exhausted. The people want order.

[Telen] Mr. Chairman, the view is that Zviad Gamsakhurdia's political defeat was related in many respects to the stance of private capital which, at one point, stopped backing him and began backing his political opponents. Tell us please, to what extent do you sense the support of private capital in Georgia, of the entrepreneurial class which has already taken shape to some extent?

[Shevardnadze] If one speaks—I don't want at the moment to analyze what happened in the past and it will take too long. As for the present state of our relations with business, with Georgian business, I would say that these are normal businesslike relations. I try, as far as I am able and as far as it is feasible, to support business because in it I see the future, so to speak, of my country. New strata, so to speak, new people with original thinking and original attitudes both toward public and private affairs and toward their own interests are indeed emerging on to the stage. Only this process requires enormous attention, enormous attention, both from legislators, from the legislature—there is a great deal to do, and many problems—and also great attention on the part of the authorities. I will try to continue to promote the development of honest business in the good sense, in the best sense of business, which can save the country in the economic sense.

[Telen] Business has already said that it intends to become actively involved in politics. Are you aware of this? Or is business not yet in a position to do this?

[Shevardnadze] I would not say that business is actively involved in politics. Business in Georgia is still working on its immediate tasks, so to speak. Business is not yet determining policy. We will have to see what happens in the future.

[Skryabin] Eduard Amvrosyevich, our time is coming to an end. Before giving you a final word, I have a question for you. Allow me to quote something you once said. You once said roughly the following: The sun rises in the north for Georgia. Don't you think that now the sun rises in the west?

[Shevardnadze] What a wicked question! [laughs] I know there is nothing bad intended, though. We get on well! If I say that this was something appropriate at the time, I would not describe it as an opportunistic phrase. I believed this, I was a committed communist. You know this well. If one talks about future relations, about building future relations between Russia and Georgia, I think that this phrase will still be relevant, if one looks to the future prospects when we will be able to build true and equal relations between the two states. I believe that this will come about. As far as the west is concerned, well, sometimes it may seem to some that it does rise in the west. If we are talking about a serious, principled attitude to politics, then I am in favor of building relations with the west, the east, the north, and with the south, will all states and countries where we have friends—where we have friends who will help us in difficult times.

[Skryabin] Thank you. You have one minute left for a final word.

[Shevardnadze] It is you who has one minute left. [laughs]

[Skryabin] Both of us have one minute left. What would you like to say in conclusion?

[Shevardnadze] First, I am grateful for this initiative, for this invitation. Perhaps I have failed to find the words which would give a better explanation of the complicated events in the Caucasus at present, as well as in Russia as a whole and other countries. I think these meetings are undoubtedly useful. If I managed to cover at least one issue so that it helped our and your television viewers to understand our affairs, I will be happy. I would like to thank you and all viewers who have listened to us now and who regard our difficulties with understanding, and are ready to support us at a difficult time. Thank you.

[Skryabin] Thank you very much. [passage omitted]

Views Russia, Other Issues

AU0604115793 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0800 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Today is Monday [5 April]. Traditionally, every Monday we broadcast the interview with Eduard Shevardnadze by journalist Nota [name indistinct]. This interview was broadcast this morning and, as usual, we repeat it in this 1200 [0800 GMT] news program. Here is the interview.

[Begin recording] [Journalist] Batoni [Georgian polite form of address] Eduard, Georgian domestic or foreign policy problems depend greatly upon the path Russia follows. Yesterday and the day before yesterday, President Yeltsin met with U.S. President Bill Clinton in Vancouver. As the Russian media has reported this morning, Yeltsin is pleased with this meeting. He said that he has found a reliable partner in Clinton. As you expected, Georgia's problems were discussed at this meeting. This probably will be a positive factor for the summit meeting that you are awaiting with President Yeltsin and, in addition, for the (?question of) Georgian-Russian relations.

[Shevardnadze] Good morning. The meeting that has just taken place in Vancouver between the Russian

president and the U.S. President undoubtedly has great importance for Russia, and not only for Russia but also, I believe, for Europe and the rest of the world, including Georgia. We are naturally interested in our country. Our interests are serious. It has to be said that certain contacts, my contacts with the U.S. Administration, preceded this meeting, not because I requested something but because the administration needed to be made aware of what is going on, what is happening in general in the Caucasus, the Transcaucasus, and, in particular, in Georgia. This includes what Russia's policy is and what, as I imagine, what should Western influence be so that the pressure of Russian reactionary forces on Georgia and the Caucasus may be weakened. I think that the specific hopes that I was pinning on this meeting have been justified. Until I have more detailed information, it is difficult for me to say what course the discussion took regarding these questions, but it is a fact that a discussion about this took place and I understand that the discussion was serious. I believe that this meeting and its results will have a certain influence on the existing situation in Russia and also on the expected referendum, that it will have definite significance for the referendum. The second thing is that any successful mission, any successful action by the president, particularly when it is connected with the West and relations with foreign countries, evokes an even fiercer reaction among those well- known circles, including those on the left. However, I believe that, basically, the influence is positive.

[Journalist] Thank you. As was learned from your Moscow interview yesterday, a meeting in Sochi is expected with Russian Defense Minister Grachev. One is left with the impression that you have more than once made stated that you would like to have a summit meeting with Yeltsin. One is left with the impression that President Yeltsin, for some reason or another, is avoiding this meeting.

[Shevardnadze] I do not believe that there are any particular reasons. I think that this meeting has not been possible yet because of the condition in which Russia finds itself, in particular, President Yeltsin himself. Of course, this meeting should not be postponed. We are now in the pre-referendum period. The situation is tense. The correct route will be to continue Russian-Georgian negotiations; we are now represented at this level and a summit meeting will be inevitable, but it will be after these preliminary negotiations. Many questions are now being raised about why Grachev is heading the Russian delegation. I have to tell you that you know my attitude regarding some of his statements and actions and I do not want to return to this question, but sometimes it is justified in politics that, in particular, a person holding such views, perhaps finds it easier to resolve those painful questions and make decisions regarding those very sensitive issues that worry us and Russia. I believe that the meeting in Sochi where the Georgian delegation will be led by [Prime Minister] Batoni Tengiz Sigua will possibly be fruitful; I believe it ought to be fruitful. This is in Russia's interests and our interests.

[Journalist] Thank you. Regarding your expected visit to Ukraine, apart from specific economic issues, it will of course be connected with political issues, particularly if we take into account the fact that Ukraine is one of those states among the former Soviet republics that has nuclear weapons.

[Shevardnadze] I consider my visit to Ukraine to be particularly important. New relations with this large country should indeed be under discussion. We have general political or economic interests and, in the final analysis, we are neighbors, if we take into account that we are united by the Black Sea, and not only the Black Sea but also by great traditions. I would say the unique friendship with this people specifically in the cultural, scientific, and economic areas and of particular interest to us is Ukraine's new role in today's Europe. As you know, Ukraine is one of Europe's giants, being in the center of Europe with its own huge economic and military potential, and, if you like, nuclear potential. I believe that with the passage of time, Ukraine's role in Europe and the rest of the world will acquire greater definition as one of the great and powerful central states that, along with others, has to determine European policy.

[Journalist] Batoni Eduard, you have often said that the key to Abkhazia's problems lies with Russia. Last week, Parliament adopted an address to the United Nations, CSCE, and international organizations for the protection of human rights. It was again pointed out that groups of separatists ensconced in Gudauta are, to all intents and purposes, carrying out ethnic cleansing on the territory under their firm control. How long will this war last, proceeding from events taking place in Russia and will its termination be somehow dependent on the referendum of 25 April?

[Shevardnadze] I have often said that, in my view, the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict is a conflict that has been planned elsewhere. Those circles are well known who are unable to conceal their own attitude toward the Abkhaz separatists and Georgia, more correctly, their own obvious support—moral, political, material, and so forth—and this was indeed planned elsewhere. These plans were drawn up neither this year nor last year but over decades and have finally succeeded in introducing these elements of instability into the life of Georgia. To what extent will the referendum have an influence? I believe that of primary importance are the talks in Sochi, how to resolve the question of the withdrawal of Russian subunits that practically represent the knot of instability and then the summit meeting will have decisive importance. I don't know when this will take place. It will probably be dependent on my and Yeltsin's timetable. However, the final word will probably be said at this meeting. The results of the referendum will undoubtedly have an influence on the general situation in the Caucasus, including the Abkhaz conflict. It possibly will not be so important because there are the preparations for the referendum itself and the period following the referendum—one, and one-half, two months—will be the time

for summing up the results and I do not think that the Abkhaz question will be the central problem for Russia during this period. Many things should be (?sorted out) before then.

[Journalist] Thank you. You just said that the presence of the Russian Army in the conflict zone is particularly exacerbating the situation. Against this background, there was ambiguous information last week regarding the fact that Eduard Shevardnadze gave monetary awards to soldiers of military formations located in the Transcaucasian district who displayed a high degree of organization during the transfer of military property to Georgia. This was how it was put. What does this mean?

[Shevardnadze] This is indeed ambiguous for someone not in the know. However, you know that we received scores and hundreds of installations from the Russian Army and this process is continuing. We still have to receive a lot—camps, entire settlements , and military installations. We have received installations that have been robbed and damaged. Of course, the majority of these installations were robbed by those people who occupied them earlier and we have behaved no better. We have also been robbing and damaging whatever has been possible to rob and damage. This part, as they say, surrendered installations in the same condition as they first received them. This is property worth billions and very necessary equipment, including weapons, particularly for the defense of Georgia and Tbilisi. I was simply carrying out my moral duty and thanking those people for doing this and maintaining these riches and leaving them for Georgia.

[Journalist] How do you assess Samegrelo's participation in the Abkhaz war [words indistinct]?

[Shevardnadze] I believe, you know, there are more emotions at play here than a desire to objectively fathom the situation. It should not be a question here of individuals. I believe there is no disputing the fact that, in spite of certain negative events, the population of Samegrelo just like our other regions, is actively participating in the struggle for the unity and integrity of Georgia. It has to be said that there are a whole number of other regions of Georgia that are possibly not fighting there as organized detachments but they are also participating, as is Samegrelo. You know that I said earlier that Zugdidi's young men are fighting and have been in Sukhumi a long time now and taken up combat positions in their time and are fighting as Georgians should fight in the interests of Georgians and Georgia. There are representatives of other regions there; there is a very interesting group there now under the command of Khobi's gamgebeli [administrative board chairman] who have not only taken up positions but have already received their military baptism and have successfully implemented a whole number of tasks that they have been set. There is a fairly strong detachment there under the command of Poti's gamgebeli; Senaki has a detachment ready and is awaiting the order [words indistinct] Tbilisi. There are also people there from Abasha and fairly good groups from other regions. So, Samegrelo like other regions, is fighting in the interests of Georgia and there are no grounds for casting aspersions upon this region. There are individual groups who are hindering this but I believe this problem will be overcome.

[Journalist] On Saturday, at meetings with members of the Constitutional Commission, you said that we are, to all intents and purposes, building a new state and are now in the initial stage of building. You also pointed out that the combination of executive and legislative powers as it exists today is temporary and that it will be of no use in conditions of building a democratic state. Work on the new constiution has, in fact, already begun and it will probably be very interesting to know if you are expecting to make any fundametal changes in the principles of state organization.

[Shevardnadze] You were right in saying that I spoke about this question but I said that, at the transitional stage, Georgia has found such a model of legislative and executive power, particularly their interaction, that, for the moment, such sharp opposition is excluded and we can see well what complications arise as a result of this dual struggle between legislative and executive power in a whole number of countries, including Russia and other [word indistinct] countries. I believe we are indeed proceeding along our original path toward the building of a democratic state. As regards the future, I said that I do not want to make any forecasts at the moment regarding what our presidential and parliamentary state will be like, either one or the other. The Constitutional Committee has set to work and all conditions exist so that Georgia can have a classical constitution, I would say a classical democractic system, taking into account our own great experience that has accumulated over the centuries. I spoke about this to the Constitutional Commission and I believe it will be like this.

[Journalist] Batoni Eduard, the media has reported that actions are again being planned in the capital regarding the fact that a statement was made during the NATO visit that if the question of the withdrawal of the Russian Army was not pointedly raised in Georgia, then NATO would not support us. Georgia will be an active neutral country and we should not expect support from NATO. As you know, 9 April falls this week, a date that is particularly painful for us, a day that, on the one hand, is tragic as a result of well-known events [the killing of approximately 20 Georgian citizens by Russian troops during the forcible dispersion of a demonstration on 9 April 1989] and a day, on the other hand, on which the independence of Georgia was declared.

[Shevardnadze] As regards our attitude to the expected actions, there is nothing ambiguous here. It will be possible to hold all manner of actions that conform to exisiting legislation but those that oppose established rules and laws will not be permitted no matter who the initiators are. The city's leadership has already expressed its attitude to this. As regards 9 April, I know that an official measure is planned; I don't know if this will be a

rally or a gathering of the population near the river [in Tbilisi]. It will be a day of remembrance from the point of view of the tragedy, from the point of view that there was indeed national self- awareness, an awakening, a kind of bell that sounded for the awakening of Georgia and all Georgians. On the other hand, it is a day of mourning for those wholly innocent people. Third, it is a warning; Georgians were once again alarmed on account of the fact that the Russian Army was used against the people and, fourth, it is connected with the declaration of independence. There are many things that are worth commemorating. I believe the decision of the city's leadership to commemorate this in a worthy way is absolutely right. As regards actions and so forth, I again repeat that all parties and political forces will be able to hold actions that conform to established rules and laws but those that oppose them and that are not in the interests of our people will be halted.

[Journalist] Today, Georgian coupons come into circulation. This is a (?sign) of our country's independence, economic independence. However, there are quite a lot of rumors circulating; the population has not unanimously responded to this fact. Of course, there are factors that explain this. To what extent has the coupon been strengthened? Is something being done in the country so that our economic development is not to be wholly dependent on help from foreign countries?

[Shevardnadze] There will be a solid currency or Georgian currency [words indistinct] the strengthening of the coupons. It is a little difficult to talk about this. If we had 1,000-2,000 tonnes of gold in the National Bank or other equivalent valuables, we could of course speak differently. Unfortunately, you know that [words indistinct] the transfer to coupons was to a certain extent a forced measure, as I told you. We did not intend to introduce coupons so quickly but events developed in such a way, [words indistinct] but our task is to learn as many lessons and acquire as many positive results as possible from the negative events. This is wholly possible if everyone works accordingly, first and foremost, the authorities, ministries, rayon [words indistinct] In particular, we are transferring to an independent monetary system. This is the first step, the first lesson and I believe that, from the point of view of acquiring experience, this will be very important. However, those persons, those citizens who are worried most of all about how to feed their children, how they are to cope, will possibly not understand the talk about this experience. Therefore, the main thing is that the coupons do not devalue quickly and, in general, do not devalue. It will be a little difficult and complex to avoid this but this process must be continued and we should not meet the introduction of a Georgian currency and money with a devastated and destroyed financial and monetary system. This is possible. It is necessary to elaborate a mechanism for protecting the coupons. The formation of such a mechanism is now gradually taking place. From this point of view, the future privileged position of these coupons and Georgian currency [word indistinct] is very important. We are creating such a situation with the coupons. It will be important that, during the transfer to Georgian money, the coupons will likewise be in a privileged position. I believe that we must seriously limit the (?mass) circulation of coupons. This must be controlled and managed, in particular by the National Bank and the quantity of coupons going into circulation should, to a certain extent, be at the center of Parliament's attention. Active participation in privatization will give more weight to the coupons; those who have coupons will have the chance to acquire installations either in total or in part [passage indistinct]. [end recording]

Estonia

Further on Russian Troop Withdrawal Issue

Foreign Ministry Statement

LD0504161893 Tallinn Radio Estonia in English 1520 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Excerpts] According to REUTER, a timetable for the withdrawal of Russian troops from Estonia and Latvia will be linked to guarantees on the protection of the rights of ethnic Russians living there, Russian President Boris Yeltsin said on Sunday [4 April]. [passage omitted]

The Estonian Foreign Ministry said in a statement that the Russian position violated international norms of behavior. The Estonian Government interprets Russia's tactics of delaying the complete and unconditional withdrawal of its forces from the Baltics as an attempt to regain control over the Baltic states, it said.

The statement said that Russia, by claiming that human rights are being violated against in the Baltics, is consciously acting in defiance of opinions by experts from the United Nations, the CSCE, and the Council of Europe, who have said Estonia's democratic constitution and legislation are in compliance with international standards. The Estonian Government cannot accept that Armed Forces which constitute a threat to the security of Estonia as well as of the neighboring countries stayed on its territory longer than absolutely necessary for their withdrawal to Russia.

Negotiator Comments

OW0504194393 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1906 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Estonia was taken by surprise when President Yeltsin announced in Vancouver that Russia is suspending troop withdrawal from the Baltic States. This statement may have a negative effect on further Estonia's talks with Russia, minister Juri Luik, head of the Estonian delegation at the talks with Russia, said in his exclusive interview for Baltfax correspondent on Monday [5 April].

He made this statement in anticipation of his departure, as head of the Estonian delegation, to the next round of the Russian-Estonian talks scheduled for April 6-7 in Nakhabino in the suburbs of Moscow.

Mr Luik maintains that "such statements cannot facilitate the signing of the Russian-Estonian agreement on troop withdrawal nor contribute to the improvement of the Estonian-Russian relations as a whole." In his opinion, such statements "will not improve the situation of the Russian-speaking population residing in Estonia either." Previously, Russia was not putting its troops pullout in dependence on any specific conditions, he said. The emergence of such conditions is likely to affect the ground rules of the negotiating process, head of the Estonian delegation indicated.

"We regard these statements as an attempt at exerting pressure on Estonia and the domestic policy it is pursuing. We do not regard this approach as constructive, considering that the objective of the Vancouver Summit was to render assistance to Russian democracy and president Boris Yeltsin," Mr Luik said, emphasizing that "two weeks ago Estonia acknowledged its support to Boris Yeltsin when he had a trying time to endure." The Estonian diplomat accused "various political forces in Russia of taking advantage of the "Baltic Card" in order to project their own "national interests." [quotation marks as received] "Yet, this is a very dangerous path: it's difficult to abandon it, while it's easy to find oneself up against the wall," Mr Luik said.

In the meantime, the Estonian minister conceded that in spite of President Yeltsin's statement, Estonia is not going to give up the idea of raising in Nakhabino the issue of holding a meeting of the two countries' state officials. "It could be a meeting of our defense ministers, prime ministers or even the presidents of the two countries. We are open for it," the Estonian representative said.

Hard Currency Payments Possible

MK0204125293 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 3

[Aleksandr Gushchin report under general headline: "Troop Withdrawal: Moscow's New Political Decision. Assessments of Pavel Grachev's Brussels Statement Get Harsher"]

[Text] Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev believes that the question of Russian troop withdrawal from Estonia and Latvia will not be resolved until the defense ministers of these states reach agreement among themselves.

Estonian Defense Minister Hain Rebas says he is prepared for such a meeting. The discussion, in his view, should focus on the questions of financing the pullout of Russian troops and providing social guarantees to servicemen, including retirees, of the former Soviet Army.

Ants Laaneots, chief of the Main Staff of the Estonian Defense Forces, who is also acting commander in chief of the Estonian Army, told a NEGA correspondent that the problems of the Russian withdrawal from the Baltic states fall under the jurisdiction of politicians, not the military. At the same time, he noted that the presence of the Russian military in Estonia would affect Russian taxpayers. Once the national Estonian currency is introduced, all payments for utilities would have to be made by the Russian military units in hard currency. Thus Russia has already run up a substantial debt to be repaid to Estonia, and every day of the Russian troops' stay in Estonia makes this debt larger...

Latvia

Gorbunovs Expresses Concern Over Yeltsin Remarks

OW0504194793 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1907 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Head of the Latvian government Anatolijs Gorbunovs has expressed concern with President Yeltsin's statement in Vancouver when the Russian president announced that Russia is suspending its troops withdrawal from the Baltic states.

President Yeltsin said at a press conference in Vancouver that Russia will put withdrawal of the Russian troops in dependence on the solution of human rights issues in regards to the Russian- speaking population in the Baltic states.

In his statement which was circulated in Riga on Monday [5 April], Gorbunovs said that "the army cannot be resorted to as a means of political dictate."

In the opinion of the Latvian leader, human rights issues need to be addressed by the UN, the CSCE conference, or in the course of bilateral talks between the two countries.

Gorbunovs indicated that he intends to appeal to the CSCE and the UN asking these international organizations to send their observers to the Latvian-Russian talks on the troops withdrawal.

Russian 'Interference' Criticized

LD0504212793 Riga Radio Riga International in English 2030 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Excerpts] Estonia and Latvia today slammed President Boris Yeltsin's comments linking troop withdrawals to rights for Russian communities, accusing Moscow of wanting to dominate the Baltic states. [passage omitted] According to deputy head of the Latvian Parliament Valdis Birkavs, this is crude interference in Latvia's internal affairs. We will cope with the problem of Russian population in Latvia ourselves on the basis of respect for human rights. [passage omitted]

Latvia's Birkavs said Yeltsin's remarks were aimed at forcing the state to change its citizenship law ahead of parliamentary elections this summer. This is crude political pressure, he said, and appealed to Western public opinion for support. [passage omitted]

'Nothing New' in Grachev's Statement on Withdrawal

MK0304120093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 3

[NEGA report: "Russia's Military Received No New Directives. There Is Nothing New in Grachev's Statement"]

[Text] Between 10,000 and 12,000 Russian soldiers can be withdrawn from Latvia during 1993, stated Janis Dinevich, head of Latvia's delegation at the Latvia-Russia talks on the army pullout. Nearly 27,000 Russian army servicemen are in Latvia at present.

Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev's statement on halting the army pullout from the Baltics, which he made in Brussels during the conference of defense ministers of NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries, does not contain, in the opinion of Janis Dinevich, anything new, since it is a logical result of the decision by Russian President Boris Yeltsin in 1992 on halting the army withdrawal. "Grachev's statement is explained by Russia's desire to draw Western countries' attention to such economic problems as the construction of housing for Russia's officers," Dinevich thinks.

He also intimated that Russian Army troops in Latvia had received no new directives and instructions, and recognized that Leonid Mayorov, commander of the Northwest Group of Forces, understands the situation that has been created in connection with the Russian Army's presence, and that he is contributing, within the limits of what is possible, to the troop withdrawal.

An official statement by the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs notes the positive positions expressed in U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher's CBS television interview.

The statement says that Christopher did not criticize Baltic countries specifically, and he did not say that violations of human rights are allowed there, since it was the former USSR as a whole that was being discussed.

The statement also notes that the United States has never recognized violations of human rights in the Baltics, and that the American side is worried over social problems rather than human rights violations.

Latvia's Foreign Ministry fully agrees with the U.S. secretary of state's stance on the observance of human rights and the rights of social and national minorities in the former USSR as a whole.

'Equality' Parliamentary Faction Appeals to Clinton

OW0304003293 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1712 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Early this week the chairman of the Latvian Parliament's faction Equality Leonid Kurdyumov and his deputy Sergey Zaletaev handed over an address to the U.S. President Bill Clinton to the U.S. Embassy to Riga.

The address published by the newspaper PANORAMA LATVII mentions the Latvian Parliament's refusal to grant election rights to its electors, including those who participated in the referendum on the republic's independence.

The leaders of this faction also declared the following: "We believe that the procedure for receiving Latvian citizenship contradicts the constitution and several norms of the General Declaration on Human Rights and international agreements which Latvia became included in on March 4, 1990 (Day of restoration of Latvia's independence—Baltfax). We are deprived of the ability of appealing against these decisions because there is neither a Constitutional Court, no any other appropriate legal body." The address expressed the hope that the U.S. Government will not stay aside with respect to the actions violating the rights of the Russians living in Latvia.

Russian-U.S. Delegation Seeks Information on POW's

OW0604113393 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1031 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Members of a mixed Russo-American commission, searching for prisoners of war and those listed missing, visited Riga on 5 April as part of its Baltic tour. They were led by Mr. Malcolm Toon, a co-chairman of the commission.

The delegation met with the Latvian parliament's vice-chairman Valdis Birkavs, who promised all information that would reach Latvian authorities from the residents of the republic who had met Americans on the territory of the former USSR at the end of world war two, during the Korean or Vietnam wars as well as data about U.S. pilots shot down over Soviet territory.

The American Embassy in Riga has also requested assistance in search for Americans reported missing. The request is addressed to those who were in Soviet camps in the 40-60s and might have encountered U.S. nationals there.

Mr. Toon has declared at the end of the visit that despite President Yeltsin's proper instruction on the initiative, over one year of work the commission has failed to achieve the expected results—none of the 78,000 American prisoners of war or listed missing in combat has been found. It's this, in Mr. Toon's words, that has prompted the commission to request local residents assistance.

He has told a BALTFAX correspondent that in the future U.S authorities, most likely in official contacts with Moscow, will underscore the lucrativeness of assistance to this effect, although the scale of American aid to Moscow will not be directly linked to the success of searches.

The American delegation flew off to Vilnius Monday [5 April] night.

Premier Heads People's Front Candidate Lists

LD0404090893 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1700 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Text] We report first about today's session of the Latvian People's Front Council [Dome]. Its agenda includes an analysis of the political situation in Latvia, the election of members of the Board of the People's Front, and discussion and approval of lists of candidates for deputies of the fifth Saeima.

The session began with Ivars Godmanis addressing members of the Dome. Remaining loyal to the principles of the People's Front, he did not forget about topical issues of everyday work and spoke about economic problems in the context of everyday life.

Uldis Augstkalns, Romualds Razuks, and Juris Stripnieks analyzed political formulations in order to assess the possibility of the People's Front implementing (?them in a program by way of using) [word indistinct] in the elections. Lists of deputies were submitted for the approval, which proceeded rather quickly because before that the members of the Council had conferred in regional groups.

Ivars Godmanis, Talavs Jundzis, and Juris Dobelis claim to represent the People's Front in all constituencies. Inguna Ebele, Janis Freimanis, and Andrejs Puzis also remain popular. Dainis Gegers also submitted his candidacy.

The Board of the People's Front was also elected. Ivars Godmanis enjoyed the largest support of Council members. Peteris Artmanis, Juris Dravnieks, and Janis Freimanis were also elected to the Board.

The People's Front Council also approved lists of People's Front candidates for election in all constituencies. There are 23 candidates for deputy in the list of candidates of the Latvian People's Front for the Riga constituency, 21 candidates for the Vidzeme constituency, 19 candidates for the Latgale constituency, 14 candidates for the Kurzeme constituency, and 16 candidates for the Zemgale constituency.

Ivars Godmanis tops the lists of candidates in all constituencies. Juris Dobelis and Talavs Jundzis are also on all lists.

A news conference concerning the session will take place at the headquarters of the People's Front of Latvia at 1200 on Monday. The main thing achieved at the session

was that with the adoption of the lists of candidates the Latvian People's Front enters the election contest, political choice is known, and the only thing that remains to be done is to draw up the lists for official submission to the Central Election Commission, while continuing to campaign for votes.

Law Adopted on Return of Confiscated Land, Property

LD0304200093 Riga Radio Riga International in English 1800 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Excerpt] The Latvian parliament on Tuesday [30 March] adopted a law regulating denationalization of real estate that was illegally confiscated during Soviet rule, including industrial enterprises, hotels, cinemas, stores, hospitals etc.

Under the law the deadline for submitting property claims is 30th June. The property rights are restored firstly by returning the property to the former owner or his heirs, secondly by granting a former owner or his heirs an appropriate share of authorized capital in a joint stock venture into which the original enterprise is reformed, and thirdly by extending due compensation to the former owner or his heirs. [passage omitted]

The only property rights that are left unrestored are the rights of shareholders of former joint stock ventures, according to the resolution of the parliamentary (?plenary) meeting of 31st March 1992. And former land owners are starting to receive their land back.

In the northeast Latvian town of Aluksne, the local board of administration confirmed (?40 Land Commission acts) on 26th March, providing for the restoration of the property rights of 40 people. Ten people were granted land for exploitation for a term of 10 years without the possibility of giving these rights to another person. Altogether the Land Commission has received 1,100 applications.

Lithuania

Prime Minister Interviewed on Talks in Russia

LD0304093993 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1800 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Text] The plane carrying Lithuanian Prime Minister Adolfas Slezevicius was scheduled to take off at 1530 Lithuanian time but it was late and it landed only just before 1900.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] This was your first visit abroad as premier of the Republic of Lithuania. How do you assess this working visit, the meeting with Russian Federation Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, and with the leadership of St. Petersburg?

[Slezevicius] Indeed, it was the first visit on my third working day, a very responsible and serious visit, a meeting with the leader of the Russian Government, Mr. Chernomyrdin. Mr. Lubys has accomplished a great deal in this sphere. This meeting was very important to Lithuania in the sense that we reached fundamental agreement on the coordination of all the sections of an agreement on free trade.

It is true that we did not succeed in signing this agreement for purely technical reasons but we agreed that at the beginning of next week the minister of power engineering and the minister of transport will again go to Moscow with their experts in order to coordinate the final wording. The wording must be coordinated in one section only, that is, the reexport of products through our country. Russia envisions rather strict economic sanctions if normal reexport in accordance with the requirements is not ensured. They reserve the right completely to annul the agreement and stop the supply of some other resources.

We succeeded in convincing them that such conditions are too strict, that we as a state cannot guarantee the work of all economic subjects. Therefore these corrections will be introduced and I think that next week we are going to have an agreement which enables us...[pauses] We discussed this with Mr. Chernomyrdin, that is, an additional agreement was reached, or more correctly, we realized the previous agreement on the supply of 1.5 million tonnes of oil.

We also discussed, both during the meeting with Mr. Chernomyrdin and during the meeting with Mr. Radionov, general director of the Lentransgaz organization, the mechanism of compensating our debts. At present, as you know, telegrams reached Lithuania that the supply of gas would be reduced by half from 1 April. They postponed this decision. We agreed that the working groups should draw up a concrete schedule of how we are going to eliminate this debt. And the possibilities exist to eliminate this debt, which is rather high and constitutes about $40 million at this time. This is, above all, the mechanism of including the debt of Kaliningrad Oblast for the supply of electric power from our country, and also a similar inclusion from Belarus of the debt of almost of 10 billion rubles, and the debt of almost 19 billion rubles by the Russian railroad system for transit through our country to Kaliningrad and from Kaliningrad.

[Correspondent] Have you met with the St. Peterburg leadership?

[Slezevicius] There were several meetings, before the meeting with Mr. Chernomyrdin and after. We discussed the possibilities of cooperation on a regional level; that is, the St. Peterburg leadership and Mr. Sobchak personally expressed great interest in drafting an agreement on economic cooperation on the regional level. We agreed that a working group of our Ministry of Industry and Trade and their workers of foreign economic relations dealing with these issues will meet and further prepare. They have proposals, interesting to our country, that is, the supply of agricultural machinery, of small tractors.

Accordingly they are interested in the supply of food products and other issues. We also discussed the setting up of a consulate in St. Peterburg. I think that this is a very ripe issue, an issue somewhat delayed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

We also had a meeting with the Lithuanian community and considered that there would be good conditions to maintain normal businesslike relations through the consulate with our countrymen in St. Peterburg and St. Peterburg oblast where there are more than 7,000 Lithuanians who are rather active people. [end recording]

Discusses Economic Situation

LD0304221593 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Text] A meeting on the issue of prices was held today at government house. After this meeting our correspondent interviewed Premier Adolfas Slezevicius:

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Esteemed premier, in spite of the fact that today is Saturday, you are working and some members of your cabinet are working. Could you tell what you have discussed and whether you adopted some decisions?

[Slezevicius] We discussed the situation in agriculture from the point of view of purchasing prices and the prices of food products. We discussed also a number of other issues. Of course, we also discussed preparations for spring sowing.

All this reflects the situation in agriculture and its reform. It so happens that on my third or fourth working day, this is not important; I must with my colleagues examine all these issues.

[Correspondent] Of course, everyone is concerned about the increase of the prices of food products, above all of milk and meat.

[Slezevicius] At the Vilnius meat combine the prices of individual meat products have increased from 1.8 to 2.3 times per week. This by no means corresponds with the rate of the increase of the prices of material and energy resources. This is dictated by completely different reasons. This is a complete ignoring of the republic's laws, first of all, of the competition and antimonopolist law. Today the government did not have juridical powers to adopt a decision because the necessary number of the cabinet members for this purpose was not taking part. But we think that on Monday, when we assemble to discuss other urgent issues, we will return to this topic and the government, I think, will recommend that the Ministry of Agriculture, as a founder, considers the suitability of the general director of the Vilnius meat combine to occupy his post.

[Correspondent] We know that President Brazauskas took part in the meeting.

[Slezevicius] The president spoke at the meeting. He expressed his wish to take part in the meeting after my return from St. Petersburg. It was very pleasant to me and the cabinet members that he not only took part but also expressed his fundamental views. We are united in our view that during this period of time which is so difficult to Lithuania we must observe discipline at all levels, all officials must observe it. We must endeavor to be in control of all processes, not in order to direct something, but to have sufficient information, to be able to forecast the processes. It happened now that we did not have full information about the possible increase of prices. We must have a system so that we can control these issues.

We agreed today, although the government had drafted such project to go over to a directive regulation of the purchasing prices, after a discussion with agricultural producers and buyers that they themselves should discuss this issue with good will and adopt decisions acceptable to both sides. It happened this time that agricultural producers in certain cases asked purchasing prices which are higher than the world prices.

With a deficit in the budget and without possibilities to subsidize food products, as has been the case in the past, we cannot agree with such prices. We are not prepared to do this in future, because if the purchasing prices are higher than the world prices, then cheaper food products will start arriving from abroad.

[Correspondent] As far as I know, there have been such proposals.

[Slezevicius] There have been such proposals. The government, assessing the situation and the general shortage of agricultural products, (?is adopting) a decision to allow imports of a certain quantity of pork. This, of course, is without precedent in the history of Lithuania and of our agriculture, when we, a traditional exporter of agricultural products, are becoming an importing country.

We must unavoidably return to an increase of pensions, to an increase of the wages of the employees at the budget institutions. They are issues at the level of (?macro) economy, of the establishment and correction of the basic proportions. We discussed this with the heads of the Ministry of Economy and of the Ministry of Social Insurance.

[Correspondent] Can people of Lithuania expect a new jump in prices?

[Slezevicius] The prices of individual food products will continue to increase, but I repeat once again that the government must seek all possible means in order to link the increase of prices with an improvement of the social insurance system. Today we pay a great deal of attention to this as it is obvious disproportion in individual branches of the economy.In such branches as agriculture the wages are 3,000-5,000 coupons per worker, and in power engineering, for example, 40,000 coupons. This is

an anomaly but a regulatory struggle with this is very complex. One must seek means of economic regulation. [end recording]

Withdrawal of Russian Military Equipment Increases

LD0504141693 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1100 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] The withdrawal of Russian military equipment from Lithuania increased significantly in March and it will not decrease in April, said Lieutenant Colonel Algirdas Jurkevicius, head of the Inspectorate for Transporting Military and Dangerous Cargoes at the Ministry of National Defense.

Almost 700 rail cars with military equipment left Lithuania in March, that is, about 300 cars more than in February. Since October last year, when the Russian troops started moving eastward, about 4,700 rail cars have left Lithuania. During the same period 227 rail cars entered Lithuania. These were mainly tankers with fuel and other materials. Ten of these cars entered Lithuanian in February and March.

According to Lt. Col. Algirdas Jurkevicius, there has been no pause in the withdrawal of the troops. As before, requests signed by Colonel General Mayorov are coming on time from Riga to Vilnius to withdraw new batches of military equipment.

Over recent months military transit through the territory of Lithuania has also increased. In March 913 rail cars with military equipment passed through the territory of Lithuania going from Germany to Russia, while during the first months of this year this figure was on average about 600 a month.

The transit from Russia to Kaliningrad Oblast is also increasing: from 82 rail cars in January to 232 in March. It must be said that during the three months of this year the amount of military equipment transported to Kaliningrad Oblast is two times less than during the last quarter of the previous year. At that time 958 rail cars were needed to transport the equipment, while now 246 rail cars are needed.

In general, only about one-third of the military cargo planned for transporting is actually moved in transit by Russian servicemen.

Military equipment is also transported to Kaliningrad Oblast from Latvia and Estonia: about 400 rail cars this year. During the last three last months of last year this number was almost 500.

Equipment is also sent back to Russia from Kaliningrad: 570 rail cars during the last quarter of last year and 530 rail cars this year.

Landsbergis Wants Russia Pressured Over Troop Withdrawal

LD0504120793 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Commenting on the troop withdrawal and relations with Russia at a news conference earlier today, Vytautas Landsbergis, leader of the opposition Tevynes Santara faction, said the Lithuanian leadership should have its own plan ready in case the situation in Russia suddenly changes and a threat to Lithuania arises. Lithuania should at least discuss an appeal to the United Nations and NATO concerning the use of peacekeeping forces, as has already been done by Estonia.

Commenting on this, Foreign Minister Povilas Gylys asked whether pressuring Russia would help stabilize the situation. The foreign minister said Lithuania's calm behavior was also approved in Strasbourg.

Going back to Vytautas Landsbergis' news conference, the opposition leader disseminated a statement concerning the agreements on the withdrawal of Russian troops. The statement says:

The Russian Foreign Ministry stated once again in its 2 April statement this year that Russia does not have signed agreements on the withdrawal of troops. It is difficult to explain this level of incompetence (?unless) [word indistinct] is incompetent and does not know about the signed agreements of 8 September 1992 between Lithuania and Russia which came into effect from the moment of signing and which has been registered with the United Nations.

International law is also mentioned in the above statement by the Russian Foreign Ministry, which claims that it supports Russia's demands concerning servicemen's social security.

This is a complete misunderstanding, Vytautas Landsbergis said. The social security of Russian servicemen is the internal affair of sovereign Russia. Russia can appeal to all the states for help to accommodate the servicemen in their new places of deployment, but Lithuania has already appealed to the West to help Russia with its complete withdrawal of the troops of the former USSR from the Baltic states. However, an issue of international help cannot be confused with the norms of international law, Vytautas Landsbergis said in his statement.

Western Military Presence Viewed

OW0504123793 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1106 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The current leadership, along with various political forces in Lithuania, should propose that the Russian government speed up the withdrawal of Russian troops from Lithuanian territory, and not prolong the procedure until 31 August 1993. Vytautas Landsbergis, leader

of opposition factions in the Lithuanian Seimas, expressed this opinion at a press conference on Monday.

In addition to this, Landsbergis pointed to the necessity of appealing to the UN and NATO with the request that "if chaos happens in Russia, blue helmets are introduced in Lithuania from western states." Landsbergis argued that such a move could be necessary since "Russia constantly tries to put concluded agreements in doubt, including the one on troop withdrawal." In his words, attitudes in the Russian army are also dangerous, since the "officers' corps of the Russian army is gradually turning into an unconstitutional military part." In addition to this, the opposition leader mentioned that Russian troops had not taken an oath of loyalty to Russia.